DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 532 TM 015 823

AUTHOR Rudmann, Jerry
TITLE Guidelines and Resource References for Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation and Development Program.
SPONS AGENCY California Community Coll. Fund for Instructional Improvement.
PUB DATE 24 Oct 90
NOTE 90p.; Paper is based on a Study of Faculty Evaluation Procedures at Irvine Valley College (California).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; *Guidelines; Higher Education; Peer Evaluation; *Pilot Projects; Professors; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Resources; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance
IDENTIFIERS *Irvine Valley College CA

ABSTRACT

Guidelines and resources for conducting a faculty evaluation were developed based on an evaluation project at Irvine Valley College (California). In the fall of 1989, eight instructors participated in a pilot test of evaluation through observation by two peers and the collection of rating forms completed by students. Participants also completed project evaluation forms, which were used to develop the spring 1990 pilot test. Seven instructors from Irvine Valley College and 14 from Saddleback College participated in this second pilot project. The revised procedures included: peer observation; student feedback; and self-evaluation. The results indicate that the following factors should be built into the faculty evaluation process: (1) checks and balances; (2) due process; (3) flexibility; (4) a built-in instructional development component; (5) use of qualified instruments; (6) careful weighing of the costs and usefulness of peer observations; (7) combination of summative and formative evaluation; and (8) sensitivity as to where the evaluation is "housed." Resources for developing a faculty evaluation and development system are listed. Project documentation and instruments used, and a 36-item bibliography on faculty evaluation are included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325532

GUIDELINES AND RESOURCE REFERENCES FOR DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Based upon a study of faculty evaluation procedures at
Irvine Valley College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

By Jerry Rudmann, Phd

Project Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JERRY RUDMANN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

October 24, 1990
2nd Printing

Funded by a Grant from
The Chancellor's Office of the
California Community Colleges'
Fund for Instructional Improvement

TM015823

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	*PAGE*
PART I. INTRODUCTION	2
Acknowledgements	3
PART II. PROCEDURE	4
The Fall Pilot	4
The Spring Pilot	5
The Instruments	6
PART III. RESULTS	8
Opinions about the teacher evaluation process	11
Questions regarding the Fall and Spring pilot tests	12
Faculty comments about the pilot test experience	14
What we learned about the instruments and procedures	19
PART IV. SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING THE EVALUATION SYSTEM	23
General procedural guidelines	23
Features to be built into the evaluation process	25
PART V. RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPING A FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM	30
Resources for developing a faculty evaluation system	30
Resources for faculty development	33
PART VI. PROJECT DOCUMENTS AND INSTRUMENTS	38
PART VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY ON EVALUATING AND DEVELOPING COLLEGE FACULTY	85

I. INTRODUCTION

The inspiration for this project grew directly from a group of eight faculty at Irvine Valley College. There were three reasons for our interest in the evaluation of faculty. First, we were not satisfied with our current faculty evaluation process; a process which is unsystematic, narrow, and relies on instruments having no psychometric footing. Second, when Irvine Valley College first opened there was, among our faculty, a good deal of sharing of concerns and ideas about teaching. As the college grew, the level of collaboration, especially across the disciplines, diminished. The faculty involved in this work saw faculty evaluation as an avenue to greater faculty sharing and excitement about teaching. Third, AB1725 was on the horizon. We were intrigued by the opportunity to design a faculty evaluation system having functional validity, considered by faculty to be fair and useful.

In the spring semester of 1988, three faculty members designed a "Voluntary Peer Observation Process," a classroom observation form, and a student feedback form. These same three faculty recruited eleven instructors to voluntarily participate in the project. During that project we discovered many things. Our instruments needed refining. Arranging peer visitations is a cumbersome task. Clerical support is essential to maintain the paperwork and keep things moving. We knew that if the project was to continue, we would need some help. At that point I decided to apply for a Fund for Instructional Improvement (FII) Grant.

Although community college faculty play many important roles, delivery of instruction is the key role. We felt that instructional delivery and course management probably should carry the most weight in an evaluation process. The project did not attempt to evaluate other important instructor roles (e.g., contribution to faculty service, contribution to community service, activities in professional organizations, and so on). It should be noted, then, that *the focus of the project was the evaluation and development of instructional delivery and, to a limited extent, course management.*

The procedure section, **Part II** of this report, describes the process and instruments used in the Fall, 1989 and Spring, 1990 pilot tests. Also presented in **Part II** are details concerning the "experimental" procedures we tried. **Part III** presents the results of the Fall and Spring pilot tests.

The experience gained from this project suggested several *guidelines* for those involved in developing a faculty evaluation system. **Part IV** presents these suggested guidelines. **Part V** provides a list of very useful *resources*. Finally, **Part VI**, "Project Documents," has reproductions of all the documents used during our pilot testing.

Acknowledgements: Many people contributed to this project. We are greatly indebted to Jeanne Egasse, Spanish instructor, and Mark McNeil, economics instructor, who pioneered the early work on faculty evaluation at Irvine Valley College. Dr. Dale Larson provided invaluable help in the preparation of the grant proposal. Recognition is due Ms. Nita Tiwari, a sophomore majoring in psychology, who researched use of the Teaching Goals Inventory as a method of improving the credibility and usefulness of student ratings. Considerable thanks are due Ms. Anne Knox who kept everything organized, moving, and on time. Deep appreciation is due to the thirty Irvine Valley College and Saddleback College instructors who, already heavily burdened by a variety of faculty duties, somehow found time to participate in this project. Last, but certainly not least, I sincerely thank the State Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges in Sacramento. The Chancellor's office staff provided excellent support and guidance throughout the grant project. To Barbara Corona, Nancy Glock and all those who coordinate the FII grant program, thank you!

II. PROCEDURE

During the grant period (July 30, 1989 to June 30, 1990) we conducted two pilot tests of experimental faculty evaluation methods. We conducted the first pilot test during the Fall semester of 1989. We ran a second, more ambitious pilot during the Spring of 1990. Both pilots incorporated evaluation procedures and instruments which were suggested by our library of faculty evaluation literature, and our collection of evaluation documents from other community college districts. During the Spring pilot we examined two innovative methods of gathering student feedback, two classroom observation forms, and a self-evaluation form.

A. The Fall Pilot. Early in the semester, a memo was distributed to recruit participants from the fulltime faculty (document A, page 40). Interested faculty were instructed to complete an application (document B, page 43). We offered instructors $320 stipends for their participation in the pilot test. Eight instructors responded to the memo.

On October 30th, all eight volunteers attended an orientation meeting. During the orientation we discussed the purpose of the project, the student feedback and peer observation instruments, and how we might best carry out the peer observations.

After some discussion, it was decided to avoid, if possible, having any two instructors visit one another's classrooms. We wished to avoid having the peer visitation become a "mutual admiration society," instead of providing an objective view of each instructor's teaching. We felt that disaggregating the evaluators and "evaluatees" would more closely simulate peer observation processes in place at other colleges. We agreed to follow a triad approach, each instructor would visit the classes of two colleagues and would, in turn, be observed teaching by another two colleagues.

To begin the pilot test, a packet was sent to each instructor. The packet contained a cover letter (document C, page 45), an observation form (document D, page 50), a set of student rating forms (document E, page 54), an overview of the project sequence, and an evaluation summary form (document F, page 58) for completion at the "evaluation conference."

Each "evaluation" proceeded as follows:

1. Peer <u>one</u> observed instructor X for sixty minutes.

2. After sixty minutes of observation, peer <u>one</u> excused the instructor from the classroom. Peer <u>one</u> distributed the student rating forms. Students completed the forms.

3. Peer <u>two</u> visited a different class taught by instructor X. Peer <u>two</u> observed instructor X for sixty minutes.

4. After sixty minutes of observation, peer two excused the instructor from the classroom. Peer two distributed the student rating forms. Students completed the forms.

5. The project director processed the student rating forms and developed a statistical summary. The statistical summaries were sent to peers one and two.

6. Peers one and two met for a "pre-conference" to compare notes and review the student rating summaries.

7. Peers one and two met with the instructor for an "evaluation conference."

8. All participants then completed a project evaluation questionnaire. The evaluation results are presented in Part III, Results.

B. The Spring Pilot. Compared to the Fall pilot, the Spring, 1990 pilot test was broader in scope. While we retained the basic peer observation triads, more instructors participated. We also tested additional methods of gathering student feedback and we attempted to add a self-evaluation component. We were interested in the concept of allowing the instructor to select some components to be used in his or her evaluation. It seemed reasonable that within some pre-set conditions or boundaries, the instructor should have some input or control over the design of the evaluation process. This approach might, we thought, encourage greater support and commitment by faculty to the evaluation process.

As in the Fall pilot, a recruitment memo was sent to all fulltime faculty (document G, page 60). This time, however, we invited instructors at our district's other campus, Saddleback College, to participate. The recruitment letter generated positive responses from twenty-eight instructors. Due to budget limitations, we accepted only the first twenty-one respondents as participants. The final pool included seven teachers from Irvine Valley and fourteen teachers from Saddleback.

In late January, 1990 we held orientation meetings at each campus to familiarize the participants with the procedures, instruments and options. Participants then completed a "Participant Option Selection" form (document H, page 64) so that appropriate evaluation packets could be assembled and sent to each instructor's two peer observers.

The Spring, 1990 pilot loosely resembled the Fall 1989 pilot. A new feature permitted participants to select the peer observation form, the method for collecting student feedback, and the self-evaluation form. The new procedures and instruments are further described on the next page.

1. **Peer observation form.** Participants selected the form developed at IVC (document D, page 50) or a checklist classroom observation form adapted from Braskamp, Brandenburg, & Ory (1984, pages 105-112). The checklist is shown in the document section (document I, page 66).

2. **Student feedback method.** Participants selected from two options. Option one was a one-page, bubble-in, rating form (document J, page 75) developed at Irvine Valley College. This student rating form could be "scanned" so that a statistical summary could be printed out (document K, page 78).

The Small Group Individual Diagnosis (SGID) method was the second option for gathering student feedback. Instead of the standard paper and pencil evaluation form, the SGID assigns a teaching colleague to facilitate a student discussion about the course and the instructor being evaluated. We used the Allan Hancock College version of the SGID (reproduced through the permission and courtesy of Allan Hancock Community College; document L, page 80).

3. **Self-evaluation form.** Participants could select from Instructor Self-Evaluation Form (ISEF) developed by Dale Brandenburg (Braskamp, Brandenburg, & Ory, 1984, pages 113-118) or the Teaching Goals Inventory (TGI) (Cross & Fideler, 1986; Cross, 1987). The ISEF asks the instructor to complete a series of forced-choice questions.

The TGI asks the instructor to focus on one course and, through the process of completing the inventory, helps the instructor to identify several major goals for the students taking the course. Instructors who completed the TGI submitted the inventory to Nita Tiwari, a research assistant/student. After examining the TGI, Nita designed several items and added them to the student rating instrument to be administered in that teacher's course. These additional items were designed to measure the students' estimates of their gains toward reaching the instructor's primary goals for the course.

This application of the Teaching Goals Inventory was, of course, very experimental, but presented a method to develop student rating items which were highly relevant to the instructor's goals. After asking instructors to think and state their most important course goals, it seemed logical to ask students to estimate their progress toward achieving those course goals. For example, an English instructor decided that, for the course in which she was to be evaluated, her primary goal was for her students to develop effective reading and writing skills. The following item, designed to reflect that goal, was placed on the student rating instrument:

In thinking over your experience in this course up to now, to what extent do you feel you have gained or made progress in the following respect?

Developing effective reading and writing skills.

Make your response by filling in a space for item number 27 as follows:

5 = very much
4 = quite a bit
3 = some
2 = very little

IV. RESULTS

Eight instructors participated in the Fall, 1989 pilot test of our evaluation model. Another twenty-one instructors were involved in the Spring, 1990 pilot. About fifteen-hundred students completed our student rating form, while another two hundred participated in the Small Group Individual Diagnosis (SGID) procedure.

At the conclusion of each semester's pilot, all participating instructors completed an evaluation questionnaire. Part 1 of the evaluation form collected opinions about the teacher evaluation process, while Part 2 sought opinions about the pilot test. Part 3 was designed to collect written comments about all aspects of the project.

The results section first presents summary statistics collected from parts 1 and 2 of the evaluation survey. The survey is reprinted and shows the faculty responses broken into percentages. All the written responses are organized by topic and are presented in part 3. The results section then moves to my comments about several experimental procedures and instruments (Instructor Self Evaluation Form, the Small Group Individual Diagnosis and the Teaching Goals Inventory) we tried during the Spring pilot. Finally, I present my biases regarding peer observation.

Part 1: OPINIONS ABOUT THE TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS

Please respond to the following statements by circling the response which best expresses your opinion.

1. **Student feedback on the effectiveness of instructional delivery should be part of the evaluation of teaching.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall	(83%)	(17%)			
Sp	(89%)	(11%)			

2. **Administrators should play a role in the evaluation of teaching.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall		(50%)	(50%)		
Sp	(33%)	(11%)	(44%)	(11%)	

3. **Peer review should be part of the evaluation of teaching.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall	(83%)	(17%)			
Sp	(78%)	(11%)	(11%)		

4. **Non-teaching duties such as committee work, club advising, community service, curriculum and program development, etc. should be considered as part of the instructor evaluation process.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall	(33%)	(33%)	(33%)		
Sp	(56%)	(11%)	(22%)	(11%)	

5. **The evaluation process outlined in our current contract is effective in acknowledging good teaching.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall			(17%)	(17%)	(50%)
Sp			(22%)	(22%)	(56%)

6. **The evaluation process outlined in our current contract is effective in recommending remediation for teaching weaknesses.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall		(17% no answer)		(17%)	(67%)
Sp			(11%)	(33%)	(56%)

7. **An instructional development center should be available to help improve the teaching of probationary, part-time and tenured instructors.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall	(33%)	(50%)		(17%)	
Sp	(78%)	(11%)		(11%)	

8. **Self-evaluation should be part of the evaluation process.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall	(50%)	(50%)			
Sp	(78%)	(22%)			

OPINIONS ABOUT THE TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS (Continued...)

9. **Each instructor should be able to select at least some of the components of the process by which he or she is to be evaluated.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall	(33%)	(17%)	(17%)		(33%)
Sp	(78%)	(11%)	(11%)		

10. **The process of observing others may benefit my own teaching.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Fall	(83%)	(17%)			
Sp	(78%)	(22%)			

11. **Each instructor should be able to specify, within a predetermined range, the relative weight assigned to each of the components by which he or she is to be evaluated.**

	a.strongly agree	b.agree	c.neutral	d.disagree	e.strongly disagree
Sp only	(44%)	(33%)		(11%)	(11%)

Part 2: QUESTIONS REGARDING THE FALL AND SPRING PILOT TEST

Please rate the following aspects of the spring, peer observation pilot test. Indicate your opinion by placing an X on the scale under each project component.

(Note: the "X" marks the average response, while the "o"s indicate the lower and upper ratings for each item.)

11. **The student feedback instrument.**

```
          Fall  o         X         o
          Sp    o      X                    o
(EXCELLENT) 5.........4.........3.........2.........1 (POOR)
```

12. **The peer observation form (used during classroom visit).**

```
          Fall            o    X    o
          Sp              o      X          o
(EXCELLENT) 5.........4.........3.........2.........1 (POOR)
```

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE FALL AND SPRING PILOT TEST (continued)...

13. **The process used to collect student input (form distributed at end of a class meeting).**

```
      Fall  o  X     o
      Sp    o        X           o
(EXCELLENT) 5.....4.....3.....2.....1 (POOR)
```

14. **The three person conference for communicating/discussing the observations and student feedback.**

```
      Fall  o      X                      o
      Sp    o      X          o
(EXCELLENT) 5.....4.....3.....2.....1 (POOR)
```

15. **The form used to document and summarize the three person evaluation conference.**

```
      Fall           o    X          o
      Sp      o      X       o
(EXCELLENT) 5.....4.....3.....2.....1 (POOR)
```

16. **Your assessment of entire project.**

```
      Fall  o      X          o
      Sp    o      X          o
(EXCELLENT) 5.....4.....3.....2.....1 (POOR)
```

17. **The small group instructional diagnostic (SGID) procedure for gathering student feedback about teaching.**

```
      Sp    o      X      o
(EXCELLENT) 5.....4.....3.....2.....1 (POOR)
```

Part 3: FACULTY COMMENTS ABOUT THE PILOT TEST EXPERIENCE

Comments regarding accumulation of student feedback:

I especially liked the use of choices for gathering the open-ended comments.

The written comments seemed to be most helpful.

The forms were good and the (summary) data provided from the evaluation forms was very helpful. It would be nice if we could assure the students that their instructor would not see the evaluations until after grades are turned in.

One cannot determine students' experiences through one classroom observation. Therefore student input is critical.

The experience (of participating) strengthened my conviction that student evaluations are vital.

It would help to have packets of #2 pencils available for students when they are asked to complete the student evaluation forms.

If you use Scantrons (to collect student ratings) delete or blacken out the space for the students' names, identification numbers, etc. Many students automatically filled in this information and then were worried about confidentiality. We need to withhold the student ratings and comments until after the instructors turn in their grades.

In my judgement, student evaluations are important, although it is hard to know just how valuable and useful they are as evaluative instruments. An opportunity for the student to comment on negative marks might be helpful. I cannot support with any enthusiasm a fifteen-minute end-of-class student evaluation, carried out while the lecturer rushes to bring things to a close and the students watch the clock to make sure they do not miss their next class.

Re the SGID...I feel it is difficult for students to be objective if they are not doing well in the class. As in any student evaluation process (for a G.E. class) the mix of student ability to remain objective about a specific teacher or "style" of teaching is almost impossible - although this seemed to be a great way of informing a teacher what many students want.

Of the various student feedback instruments/methods I only like the Scantron form with questions printed on the front, with comments collected on the back.

The student feedback was very enlightening.

FACULTY COMMENTS ABOUT THE PILOT TEST EXPERIENCE (continued)...

Comments regarding accumulation of student feedback (continued):

Steps should be taken to make sure students know why they are doing the evaluation. It should be made clear that their grades won't be influenced.

Of the many evaluation forms I have seen, designed and used over years of teaching, I believe the SGID has the most promise for identifying and more importantly helping to promote excellence in the classroom.

Comments regarding the peer observation form (used during the classroom visit):

There should be a separate evaluation form for activity or lab classes. Most questions related only to lecture classes.

It (the form) was difficult to complete when using it on teachers outside of my discipline.

I do not think the peer evaluation form is especially helpful. I think it can too easily be misinterpreted. But comments made directly to the instructor--or perhaps a written summary of observations such as these--seem to be very helpful.

Comments regarding the classroom observation:

Provide a list of features to be observed. Design a "trigger" film for use in training observers what to look for.

I would suggest that the project be followed by training opportunities for faculty to learn how and what to observe, how to minimize fear of legal repercussions, how to present comments to "evaluatees," etc.

The classroom observation is imperative. We must be able to observe the instructor in action.

I found my lack of expertise in the instructional areas I observed to be a serious obstacle to a proper evaluation. At least an observer with subject matter expertise might help.

Classroom observation should be mandatory for all faculty; the peer evaluation should however include information beyond one class session: perhaps two session; perhaps a review of exams and handouts, etc.

FACULTY COMMENTS ABOUT THE PILOT TEST EXPERIENCE (continued)...

Comments regarding the classroom observation:

Even though the observation procedure was in a field outside the major of the faculty doing the observation, teaching technique and effectiveness is easy to evaluate. BUT the content should be evaluated by a peer in the same field (major area of study).

I was not especially enamored of cross-disciplinary matchings. I enjoyed watching _____ and _____ teach, but I was not at all confident of my ability to provide either of them with a solid observation due to my fundamental ignorance in the subjects of their presentation. In addition, the evaluator misses the context of the lecture almost entirely, and this absence is, I submit, far more serious than it might appear. A class is not really a discrete entity, no matter how much the temporal and spatial distinctions would seem to signify otherwise. The subject of every class is inextricable from the larger emerging subject of the course in general. From the evaluator's point of view, it is part of (and only knowable within) a continuum which is described by course content, method, mood, and like matters. I think both instructor and evaluator fall easy prey to the fallacy that the observed hour may be used as indicative (or representative) of the class in general. I would agree, however, that there may be certain indices of competency that could be applied in a cross-disciplinary way (e.g., all lecturers should address their audiences in an audible manner, all instructors should employ clear and fair grading standards, etc.).

Comments regarding the conference with the co-observer:

This was very helpful for the two observers. It provided an opportunity to learn as well as evaluate.

The pre-conferences helped to eliminate random observations and to focus peer comments. The machinery (setting up of conferences) was, however, rather clumsy and difficult to coordinate.

It might help to develop a form to generate some specific guidelines for evaluation, then allow for additional comments.

Very good. It didn't take very long but it was useful to help coalesce one's thoughts.

This was extremely enjoyable. I was given the opportunity to interact with a colleague that otherwise I would have only passed in the hall!

Comments regarding the conference with the co-observer (continued):

We saw very different features of performance. We seemed to learn as much from that as we did from the class itself. It only took 15 minutes or so for this part. Might take more if the performance wasn't good.

Comments regarding the conference with the evaluatee:

Important - but must be handled diplomatically. Perhaps a non-involved mediator should be present. Also, positive should be expressed, as well as teaching strategies known to observers to be effective that are deemed as necessary.

This was very good. It is good if, at the conference with the co-observer, some of the observations are written - particularly any critical comments. This is because when the evaluatee is present it is more difficult to be critical. Working from a list should help this.

Maybe we should put together a form to generate some specific guidelines for evaluation, then allow for additional comments.

Was slightly uncomfortable when criticism was involved.

Very helpful for us.

At least an hour should be allotted for this meeting! Comments from peer in my own division were very valuable!

I think the instructor benefits from talking with a small group of peers--not just with one other. Potentially awkward exchanges are eased by this situation, and criticism one might find a little hard to take from one person is a lot easier to take from two.

Other comments:

1) Videotaping the instructor may be interesting as is the idea of contacting former students. 2) The instructor should provide the information about participation in committee work and staying current in the field to the evaluators prior to the conference. 3) I'm curious about whether student retention rates should be looked at. 4) I'm pretty sure that the greatest value of this program is what one learns as an evaluator. The opportunity to sit in on someone's class is very educational.

FACULTY COMMENTS ABOUT THE PILOT TEST EXPERIENCE (continued)...

A tricky part was the logistics of arranging times, etc. Perhaps an NCR form or a tear off sheet would help so the evaluatee could make a selection and let the observers know his or her schedule. The evaluator could then indicate when he/she planned to observe. Something like:

Dear_____,
During the week of_____, I teach:
Art 3, 9-12 M in A309 Topic:_____
Art 9, 7-10 W in B201 Topic:_____

I really enjoyed the whole process.

We needed this to help us in the future.

...I think the absence of self evaluation is a serious shortcoming in the system as I used it. I did not employ the "goals and objectives" method [Teacher Goals Inventory], so I do not know how I would have responded had I done so, but I think effective peer evaluation begins with a serious self evaluation by the faculty member. What am I trying to do? What do I think I am doing well? What concerns me about my teaching? What are my perceptions of my students? What can I do to improve the instruction in this class? What would I like a peer to observe on my behalf?

All in all, I think I would prefer a kind of cafeteria system where the instructor met with an evaluating committee of his or her peers (say three faculty members) and designed in conjunction with them an evaluation process, perhaps by selecting from a range of pre-approved instruments. I favor the actual evaluation being an evaluation of a file by an evaluating committee, with certain things being required of all files and other things being optional. The instructor would largely decide what sorts of things ought to go into the file and the evaluators would then "work through the file," first on an individual and then on a collective basis prior to the meetings with the instructor.

Section 4: WHAT WE LEARNED ABOUT THE INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES

1. Student feedback instrument. The participating faculty generally felt that the bubble-in feedback instrument (document J, page 75) was acceptable. As shown in results section 2, the student feedback instrument was given a 4 rating in the Fall and a 4.2 rating in the Spring. It should be mentioned, however, that there are serious problems associated with "in-house" designs of such instruments. Typically the designers are administrators and faculty who, although well-meaning, lack sufficient training in the technology of test design. A thorough psychometric review and revision of the instrument must be conducted on this instrument. At this point, it makes more sense for our district to acquire a commercially available student feedback instrument which has been thoroughly researched.

Those familiar with the matriculation regulations know that the instruments with which we assess students' reading, writing, and computational abilities must possess all the criteria of a qualified test: sufficient reliability and validity, appropriate norms, no evidence of cultural bias, etc. One cannot disagree with the matriculation regulations, at least as they pertain to assessment of student abilities, because such regulations provide some assurance that testing will be fair, non-discriminatory, and provide relevant, accurate information.

Akin to the rigor with which we should scrutinize the matriculation assessment instruments, student rating instruments should conform to the same high standards. This is especially important if student feedback is part of a comprehensive evaluation process which could, in some cases, lead to denial of tenure. Unless a college has an individual qualified to develop the student rating form, it would be better to purchase a commercially available instrument (see Abrami & Murphy, 1980). If the instrument is developed in-house following a sound psychometric approach, it will eventually, in all likelihood, come to resemble one of the commercially available instruments.

2. The Small Group Individual Diagnosis (SGID) procedure. Six instructors facilitated the SGID during the spring pilot test. All those who facilitated, as well as those were the subject of the procedure, felt the SGID provided useful information and that the process merits further testing. It is highly recommended that SGID facilitators receive training in the method before conducting the class discussions. Due to lack of resources, the facilitators in our pilot were not trained in the method.

I suggest that the SGID be an option available to the instructor who is undergoing an evaluation. Considering the countless social and psychological variables which influence group discussions, the SGID process is not readily amenable to assessment of its reliability and validity. As such, I would not recommend the SGID as part of a comprehensive evaluation process which leads to tenure decisions. Instead the SGID seems much more appropriate as a back-up to student ratings. It appears to have excellent potential as a staff development tool.

3. *The Instructor Self-Evaluation Form (ISEF).* Some of the participating instructors completed the ISEF. Unfortunately, we were unable to acquire any information regarding interpretation of the ISEF. We made several unsuccessful attempts to contact the instrument's author, Dale Brandenburg. Brandenburg has left the University of Illinois. Meanwhile, the University of Illinois no longer uses the ISEF.

4. *The Teaching Goals Inventory.* All four instructors who completed the TGI felt it to be worthwhile. The TGI, you may recall, guides the instructor through a thought process which culminates with a list of goals - learning outcomes - which, hopefully, the students will achieve as a result of having been in the course. In most cases, the students in our pilot felt they had made progress towards the goals their instructors had set for them.

The TGI can help teachers determine whether their instructional practices are accomplishing their instructional goals. The instructor can use various feedback devices throughout the term to determine whether students are making progress towards the instructional goals (Cross, 1987).

In the overall evaluation process, the TGI can serve as part of self-evaluation and student feedback. After completing the TGI, the instructor can design questions for students regarding their achievement of the instructor's goals. These questions could be added to the standard student rating questionnaire.

5. *Peer observations.* Many of the participants were pleased to have an opportunity to observe a colleague teach. Since the participating instructors had volunteered to test a peer observation system, it seems likely that they were among those faculty who are least threatened by the thought of being observed by a peer. Perhaps the most valuable function of peer observation is the opportunity to learn how other instructors deliver instruction. As such, some system of peer observation could become an extremely useful tool for faculty development.

5. *Peer observations* (continued)...

Every college has, it seems, instructors having excellent instructional delivery skills. Faculty development staff should consider these instructors to be a resource for faculty development. These instructors could greatly assist the faculty evaluation and development program merely by allowing, if not encouraging, faculty (especially non-tenured and/or faculty receiving unfavorable evaluations in the area of instructional delivery) an open invitation to visit their classes.

Prior to the pilot test, we had not considered the use of peer observation as a tool for faculty development. The primary and only reason peer observations were built into this project's design was to test it as a method of instructor evaluation. *There are reasons, however, NOT to use peer observation as a component of the evaluation process.*

Before continuing, I must state that *the following paragraphs reflect my opinions regarding the use of peer observations for faculty evaluation purposes. The opinions and reasoning expressed in this section do not necessarily reflect the faculty or administration at Irvine Valley College.*

Should peer observation be part of the faculty evaluation process? First, one hour of peer observation isn't necessarily a representative sample of an instructor's typical classroom "performance." Many of the instructors in our pilot tests mentioned the tendency to "get ready" for the peer visits to their classroom. It's totally understandable that a person wants to look his or her best during observation by a colleague, but it is exactly this desire to form a positive impression which undermines the value of classroom observations. A useful classroom observation method should try to capture the instructor's *typical teaching*.

Related to the problem of image enhancement is that of the loss of context inherent in a single observation. As one of the faculty participants in the project stated, "the evaluator misses the <u>context</u> of the lecture almost entirely, and this absence is, I submit, far more serious than it might appear. A class is not really a discrete entity, no matter how much the temporal and spatial distinctions would seem to signify otherwise. The subject of every class is inextricable from the larger emerging subject of the course in general. From the evaluator's point of view, it is part of (and only knowable within) a continuum which is described by course content, method, mood, and like matters. I think both instructor and evaluator fall easy prey to the fallacy that the observed hour may be used as indicative or (representative) of the class in general."

Aside from the lack of representativeness, logistics problems are associated with peer observations. The pilot test design required that each participant observe the classes of two colleagues, and be observed by two other colleagues. The participants often found it difficult to arrange observation times compatible with one another's schedules.

5. *Peer observations* (continued)...

Fourth, the process is cumbersome and adds to the strain of already full schedules. Fulltime faculty at community colleges are busy people. Besides heavy teaching loads, instructors serve on various committees and conduct important, college-related activities. An evaluation program which adds a series of peer-visitations to everyone's schedule isn't very enticing.

A related concern is the need for training. Objective peer observation requires training and periodic evaluation of the training's effectiveness. Some ways to improve observer objectivity and inter-reliability include training through the use of a videotaped lecture (a "trigger film"), videotaping lectures for confirming one's observations, etc.

To review, a peer evaluation process introduces serious concerns about the representativeness of a given classroom observation. It may be possible to train faculty to improve the objectivity of the observations and increase agreement by co-observers. However, even when the observation is made more objective, it still lacks important contextual tie-in to the rest of the course. A peer observation system places additional workload and time constraints on faculty. Finally, most experts agree (Aleamoni, 1982; Centra, 1979; Cohen & McKeachie, 1980) faculty should not be evaluated through the use of peers as classroom observers.

There is an easy solution to the drawbacks associated with peer observations: *student ratings*. An enormous amount of research has shown that student ratings, when properly collected, are reliable indicators of instructional delivery. Ratings by a classroom of students, collected through a psychometrically valid instrument, are the solution. Instead of the sixty minute sample provided by a peer visitation, students sit through the entire course. Furthermore, the ratings can provide information about the instructor's course management skills (e.g., "observes office hours," "provides a syllabus for students," "returns grades within a reasonable time," "usually arrives to class on time," etc.).

Students cannot, of course, evaluate a number of other areas: the instructor's expertise and currency in the discipline, many features of the course design, the teacher's contribution to faculty and community service, etc. These latter indices of teaching effectiveness should be assessed through some combination of self-evaluation, peer review, and chair/dean review.

Instead of peer observations, "A more cost-efficient and reliable use of peer judgements of teaching effectiveness would be in the review of written documentation (e.g. instructional plans, course materials and examinations, instructional methods, etc.) (Aleamoni, 1984)."

IV. SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

A. General procedural guidelines.

1. *Seek a team approach.* Form a steering committee whose purpose is to facilitate development of a faculty evaluation process and model. The committee's membership should include faculty representatives from the faculty association, academic senate, and the various discipline areas. Administration representatives should, as well, serve on the committee. It makes sense to have faculty and administration working together from the beginning. If one group does not participate, the excluded group may become suspicious of the process, and have little understanding or faith in the product.

2. *Seek maximum input from faculty and administration.* At key points, the committee should seek input through the use of surveys, in-service workshops, and visits by committee-members to division or department level meetings. The committee must try to maintain a high profile throughout the development of the evaluation system. Not every faculty member will care or respond to requests for input, but it is essential that every instructor knows that faculty input is desired.

3. *Begin developing the evaluation process at the right point.* Do NOT begin, as many colleges do, by designing the evaluation instruments. Begin, instead, by listing the many roles that faculty play at your institution (Areolla, 1987). Determine which of these roles ought to be part of the evaluation process. Develop observable, measurable definitions of those roles. Decide how much weight each role should carry in the evaluation. Identify sources of information regarding each role. Finally, develop or purchase the forms and instruments. Faculty and administration must be consulted and informed during each step of the process. (See the resource section for "Eight steps in developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation and development system.")

4. *Move slowly and realistically.* Be prepared for the politics and resistance the committee will encounter. See the next page for the "politics of evaluation," and "the stages of faculty resistance."

A. General procedural guidelines (continued)...

a. The politics of evaluation. *There are often four different factions that a college has to consider when it develops a system of faculty evaluation. The first group consists of the "purists." The purist group insists that faculty performance must be quantified and measured with microscopic precision. They want to be able to rank all 200 faculty members on campus; otherwise they feel the system is not working. Another group is called the "utopians." This group finds fault in every instrument or system devised. They want the perfect instrument, and, if they find one even partly defective, which they invariably do, they conclude that the system is worthless. The third group is called the "saboteurs." They pretend to support efforts to develop evaluation systems, but they find fault in every approach and call for endless refinements. The fourth group is referred to as the "naive." They are ready to adopt any instrument or any system without thinking through its implications or whether it will work. No doubt, on most campuses, there is a fifth group called the "realists." The realists know that whatever is put together one year may have to be modified the next. They know also that people are going to be evaluated whether you set up a system or not and that not setting up a system is worse than working on a year-to-year basis until something worthwhile evolves* (Centra, 1987, p. 54).

b. The stages of faculty resistance. Expect faculty to resist. Experience has shown that faculty resistance, which lasts from twelve to eighteen months, undergoes five predictable stages (adapted from Areolla, 1983, p. 88).

Stage 1. Disdainful denial stage. "It'll never work."

Stage 2. Hostile resistance stage. As the most resistant faculty become aware that a faculty/administration group is continuing ahead with the development and implementation of the program, complaints will flow into administration and are aired in Senate and Association meetings.

Stage 3. Apparent acquiescence stage. The most resistant faculty resign themselves that an "arbitrary and unnecessarily complex" program is on the way. A few voices of support begin to appear.

Stage 4. Attempt to scuttle stage. Certain faculty and chairpersons or deans greatly exaggerate the "problems" the new program is causing.

A. General procedural guidelines (continued)...

Stage 5. Grudging acceptance stage. After eighteen months to two years of operation, faculty find that the program can actually be of some value.

5. *Make thorough use of the existing information about faculty evaluation.* Colleges and universities have been conducting faculty evaluations for years. Educational researchers have continually been studying, evaluating and documenting the merits of many procedures and instruments. There exists a vast body of knowledge on the evaluation of college instructors. (See the resource chapter for some key references).

B. Features to be built into the evaluation process.

1. Checks and balances. The evaluation system should be comprehensive and make use of multiple sources of information. Multiple sources will protect the faculty member from caprice, protect the administration from accusations of bias, and enhance the prospects of gathering meaningful, useful information. Multiple sources will increase both the reliability and validity of the process. The multiple source approach will decrease the workload of those serving on a peer review team by relying on sources besides peers alone to conduct faculty evaluations.

2. Due process. The evaluation system should provide clear, unambiguous criteria and procedures for making tenure decisions. The system should recognize the legal rights of the evaluatee as well as those serving on the peer review committee. Seldin offers a "due process checklist" for faculty evaluation programs (1984, p. 4).

> *The following suggested checklist was developed from an examination of recent court decisions and the EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) guidelines plus a close review of current literature on the legal aspects of faculty evaluation.*
>
> *a. Administrators, especially department chairs, should have current and accurate knowledge about the obligations, rights, and responsibilities of colleges and universities as they relate to the evaluation of faculty performance.*
>
> *b. The criteria and procedures in the evaluation process should be provided in detailed, written form to every faculty member.*
>
> *c. Multiple evaluation sources should be used and each source pursued independently.*

B. **Features to be built into the evaluation process (cont.)...**

Due process checklist (continued)...

d. Evaluators should be adequately trained in the use of faculty evaluation instruments.

e. Faculty members should have the opportunity to respond in writing to an evaluation with regard to its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.

f. Faculty members should be evaluated in accordance with established performance standards and the actual work assigned.

g. The results of performance evaluation should be promptly given to faculty members.

h. Specific and valid reasons should be given to faculty members for adverse promotion or tenure decisions.

i. A formal appeal system should be part of the faculty evaluation program.

j. Institutions should employ legal counsel who have current and accurate knowledge of affirmative action and EEOC guidelines.

3. *Flexibility.* The evaluation process must have the flexibility to accommodate important differences among the disciplines. The system should, for example, provide for meaningful evaluation of vocational and non-vocational disciplines. The system should adapt to the meaningful evaluation of counselors and librarians.

Furthermore, the system should permit some degree of "customization" at the individual level. An instructor should be able to determine, within pre-determined boundaries, both the roles (i.e., teaching, faculty service, community service, etc.) and their relative weights to be used in his or her evaluation.

4. *Build an instructional development component into the evaluation system.* Perhaps the biggest mistake is to plan and implement a faculty evaluation program with no reference to a faculty development program.

B. Features to be built into the evaluation process (cont.)...

> *When this is done, the message the faculty are likely to receive is "We're going to find out what you're doing wrong and get you for it." If an integrated faculty evaluation and development program is implemented, the message sent is "We're going to help you determine your strengths and weaknesses and provide you with the resources you need to both enhance your strengths and overcome your weaknesses* (Arreola, 1983 p. 87).
>
> *Experience has shown, time and time again, that a faculty evaluation system implemented without reference or connection to a faculty development program will generate greater amounts of anxiety and resistance among faculty than if it is part of a larger faculty development/instructional improvement effort. Likewise, experience has also shown that faculty development, operated in isolation or without reference to a faculty evaluation program, tend to attract mainly those faculty who need their services least* (Arreola & Aleamoni, 1988, p. 27).

5. *Use qualified instruments.* Most student evaluation instruments which are designed "in-house" have serious deficiencies and often are misleading. To be practical and reliable such instruments must undergo certain design steps and twelve to eighteen months of careful psychometric evaluation and fine-tuning. It makes more sense to select from qualified, commercially available instruments. (See Abrami & Murphy, 1980 for an excellent review of 12 leading, commercially available student rating instruments).

If your evaluation system includes classroom observations by peers or administrators, the observation instrument should be carefully chosen or designed. This instrument will require the same care given to development of the student rating instrument.

6. *Carefully weigh the costs and usefulness of peer observations.* While AB1725 mandates an evaluation system centering around peer review, "peer review" does not necessarily mandate the use of peer observations. Peer review can instead involve reviewing and rating an instructor's effectiveness in such areas as instructional design, pursuing professional growth, and other elements of teaching not amenable to classroom observation. Many colleges and universities rely on student ratings as the information source when evaluating the instructional delivery component of teaching.

B. **Features to be built into the evaluation process (cont.)...**

Regarding the use of peer observations (continued)...

As described in the procedure chapter of this report, the instructors who participated in our pilot tests were placed into triads. Each instructor observed the classroom of two other teachers, and was, in turn, observed teaching by two peers. Most participants in the project found that watching a colleague teach is a very positive experience. Yet, I have doubts about the usefulness and costs of peer observations for evaluation purposes. My reasoning follows. (The following are *my* opinions and do not necessarily reflect opinions held by the faculty or administration at Irvine Valley College).

a. Most faculty are teaching heavy loads and attending numerous meetings, etc. A peer observation system will add more strain to faculty. Finding a time to observe a class which doesn't conflict with one's own teaching, committee, and office hours can be frustrating. Time spent observing adds to an already busy schedule.

b. If peer observation is built into the evaluation process, it follows that peer observers should be properly trained. Several participants in our pilot tests mentioned the need for training. Training will require additional time and the services of a qualified trainer.

c. One visit to the classroom will not necessarily, if ever, constitute a representative sample of the course. Most participants in our pilot test admitted to the tendency to do more than their usual amount of preparation for the classes in which a peer visited. As such, the peer observer is *not necessarily the way the teacher normally conducts a class.*

Regarding the use of peer observations (continued)...

d. If a qualified student rating instrument is used and administered in the proper manner, students who have sat through the course are a better source of information about the instructional delivery component of teaching. Additionally, the student rating instrument can provide some valuable information regarding the instructor's course management skills (e.g., "instructor usually begins class on time," "instructor usually is available during office hours," "instructor is prompt in returning grades," etc.). Even if the evaluation does include peer observation, student ratings are an important source of information about instructional delivery since one sixty minute observation may not be representative of the teacher's everyday classroom "performance."

e. Peer observations are more appropriate for instructional development purposes. One way a college's outstanding instructors can contribute to the faculty development program is to invite peers to visit their classrooms. The best method may be for the instructional development coordinator to arrange for visitations.

f. "A more cost-efficient and reliable use of peer judgements of teaching effectiveness is the review of written documentation...(Aleamoni, 1984)." Thus, peers can review a portfolio prepared by the instructor undergoing evaluation. The portfolio can include evidence of good course design, contributions to faculty and community service, professional development, etc. The peer reviewer can look through the portfolio and rate it when he or she has some time, even on the weekend if need be. Aleamoni suggests that the peer review system be designed to assure "the reliable differentiation of different levels of faculty performance" through "the establishment of minimum standards for each criterion," and adequately designed rating scales. Aleamoni further suggests that to obtain reliable measurements, no fewer than three and no more than six tenured faculty members should serve on a review panel. Finally, to avoid a positive bias, "anonymity is more likely to produce candid and meaningful peer evaluation. In fact, positive bias of peers may result in undifferentiated, high evaluations of faculty unless review is anonymous."

7. *Design the system to accommodate the dual purposes of evaluation.* Faculty evaluation has two purposes: to improve instruction and to make personnel decisions, or *formative* and *summative* evaluation. The key personnel decision is whether or not to award an instructor tenure. Some colleges have developed procedures, forms, and instruments for evaluations to improve teaching and quite distinct procedures, forms, and instruments to gather information regarding tenure decisions. It is far more efficient to develop one process which accommodates both purposes. It makes sense to design a process which yields an evaluation "score" which is a composite of ratings from each source of the evaluation (Arreloa, 1987; Arreola & Aleamoni, 1988). How the evaluation data is used depends, of course, on the purpose of the evaluation. While the total score, especially the total score *trend* over several semesters, is appropriate to summative evaluation, the component scores and highly detailed information is more useful and appropriate for improving instruction.

8. *Be sensitive as to where the evaluation program is "housed."* Experts (e.g., Arreola, 1983; Arreola & Aleomoni, 1988) recommend that a faculty evaluation *and* development office be established, and that the office NOT be located within an administrative office. A typical efficient and cost-effective method is to combine a media center, test scoring office, and any other instructional support or development office into one organizationally integrated unit. Experts recommend that this unit be placed "under the direction of someone trained in evaluation and instructional development or educational psychology, and most important, someone who has an affably non-threatening manner that inspires confidence (Arreola, 1983)."

The preferred mode, then, is the integration of the faculty development and evaluation programs and a close correspondence between the elements of each. The faculty should have institutional support when the evaluation system detects a weakness in their performance. If, for example, instructional delivery is evaluated as part of the overall evaluation of the teaching role, then the instructional development program should offer resources which can help the teachers improve their instructional delivery, and so on. (Part V presents suggestions for resources to be offered by an office of instructional development).

V. RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPING A FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

For the past few years, Irvine Valley College has accumulated ideas, articles, and books about faculty evaluation and faculty development. This section presents the best of those resources. Much of this information will prove invaluable to any college finding itself in the process of designing or redesigning a system for evaluating its teachers. Part A presents resources for faculty evaluation. Part B presents resources and ideas for the faculty development component of faculty evaluation.

A. Resources for Developing a Faculty Evaluation System.

1. **Workshop.** *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: The role of peers, students, and supervisors in evaluating college faculty.*

This is a two day workshop presented by two respected experts in the field of faculty evaluation, Raoul A. Arreola and Lawrence M. Aleamoni. Participants receive copies of *A Handbook for Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System* (Arreola), *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction* (Aleamoni), and a *Student Rating Form Selection and Development Kit* (Aleamoni & Arreola). Information about these workshops is available from:

CODES
6730 N. Camino Padre Isidoro
Tucson, AZ 85718
Phone (901) 682-9761

COMMENT: I attended this workshop. The presenters are excellent, the handout materials are extensive, comprehensive and exceedingly useful. <u>You will not a find better resource</u>. The workshop and materials present a proven process for developing a faculty evaluation system for any college. The basic steps in the process are presented below.

2. **Eight steps in developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system** (adapted from Arreola, 1987):

   a. **Determine the faculty role model.** Which of the many activities faculty engage in should be evaluated? Reach consensus.

   b. **Determine institutional role priorities.** Establish the relative importance of each role to the institution by determining how much value or "weight" may be placed on each role in the faculty role model. Set a maximum and minimum weight which the performance of a given role should have on a faculty member's overall evaluation.

2. **Eight steps in developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system** (continued):

   c. **Define roles in terms of observable performance or documentable achievements, products, or performance.** From this, establish role defining categories or components. (For example, the role of TEACHING may include: instructional delivery, content expertise, course management, etc.).

   d. **Determine role component "weights."** Determine how much relative weight each role component will have on the overall evaluation of the role. (For example, the role components of TEACHING could be weighted as instructional delivery skills: 60%; course management: 10%, etc.).

   e. **Select appropriate sources of information regarding the various roles.** Reach a consensus regarding which source or sources should provide the information for evaluating each role. Then **determine how to gather information from the sources.**

   f. **Determine the weight to be assigned to each source.** Determine the amount of value or weight that should be placed on the information provided by the various sources.

   g. **Design or select appropriate forms, questionnaires, and protocols.**

   h. **Develop criteria for an office of instructional development.** Develop qualifications for the coordinator position. Establish a list of instructional resources and activities.

3. **Books regarding faculty evaluation systems.**

   a. Abrami, P. C., & Murphy, V. *A Catalogue of Systems for Student Ratings of Instruction.* Centre for Teaching and Learning Services:
      McGill University
      815 Sherbrooke Street West
      Montreal, Quebec
      Canada H3A 2K6
      1980

      A review and comparison of twelve leading, commercially available student rating instruments (29 pages). This is the best source we have found on this topic. It is excellent.

3. **Books** (continued)...

b. Aleamoni, L. M. (Ed.). *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (31), 1987.
This book has many relevant articles. See especially Arreola, R. A., " A Faculty Evaluation Model for Community and Junior Colleges."
Also important is Aleamoni, L. M., " Typical Faculty Concerns About Student Evaluation of Teaching."
Aleamoni lists eight faculty concerns about student evaluation and the research evidence which addresses those concerns. This information can be useful for easing faculty concerns over student evaluation.

b. Braskamp, L. A., Brandenburg, D. C., & Ory, J. C. *Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness, a practical guide.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1984.
Includes examples of many evaluation instruments.

c. Centra, J. A. *Determining Faculty Effectiveness: Assessing Teaching, Research, and Service for Personnel Decisions and Improvements.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
A review of self, student, and peer evaluation. Considers the legal aspects of using faculty evaluation for purposes of personnel decisions.

d. Millman, J. *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1981.

4. **Articles.**

a. Arreola, Raoul A. In A. Smith (Ed.) "Establising Successful Faculty Evaluation and Development Programs," *Evaluating Faculty and Staff*, New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
This article presents practical suggestions for coping with faculty resistance and administrative apathy. An important article.

b. Seldin, P. *Court Challenges to Tenure, Promotion, and Retention.* Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, *IDEA Paper no. 12,* Kansas State University, 1984.
Seldin discusses the importance of building due process into the faculty evaluation system.

B. Resources for Faculty Development. The faculty evaluation literature repeatedly states that an evaluation program will succeed *only* if it includes a faculty development program. Most colleges and universities have established faculty development functions under a variety of titles: The Center for Academic Excellence, The Office of Instructional Development, or a similar title. As stated in chapter IV of this report, Suggested Guidelines for Developing the Evaluation System, *faculty development is an essential component of faculty evaluation.* The following books, articles, and programs are suggested minimum resources for a faculty development office.

1. **Information About Conducting a Faculty Development Program.**

Aleamoni, L. M. (ed.), *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction.* New Directions in Teaching and Learning, No. 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
This book contains several articles justifying an instructional development component in the faculty evaluation system.

Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. *Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development: An analysis of Effective Programs and Practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
A review of a variety of faculty development programs at many colleges and universities. Practical guidelines for effective programs.

Levinson-Rose, J., & Menges, R. J. "Improving College Teaching: A Critical Review of Research." *Review of Educational Research,* 1981, 51, 403-434.
A research review of the effectiveness of a variety of strategies designed to improve instruction.

Sedlin, P. & Associates. *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
Development of college faculty from the perspective of administration.

2. **Classroom Assessment Techniques.**

Cross, P. C., & Angelo, T. A. *Classroom Assessment Techniques. A Handbook for Faculty.* National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. 2400 School of Education Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.
Phone: (313) 936-2741
This excellent publication describes thirty classroom assessment techniques. Instructors can easily adopt these methods to make positive adjustments in their teaching and to improve student learning.

3. **Teaching Tips for the College Instructor.**

a. McKeachie, W. J. *Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher.* Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1986.

b. Gibbs, G., Habeshaw, S., and Habeshaw, T. *Fifty-Three Interesting Things to do in Your Lectures.* Bristol, England: Technical and Educational Services, 1984.

c. Whitman, N. A., Spendlove, D. C., & Clark, C. H. *Increasing Students' Learning: A faculty guide to reducing stress among students.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4, 1986.
This book contains many practical tips for improving student participation class discussions, reducing student stress, motivating students, and helping students learn. A very helpful book.

4. **For Improving Classroom Discussions:**

   a. Bouton, C., & Garth, R. Y. (eds). *Learning in Groups.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 1H. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

   b. Davis, R. H., Fry, J. P., & Alexander, L. *The Discussion Method*, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1977.

   c. Whitman, Neal, & Schwenk, T. L. *A Handbook for Group Discussion Leaders: Alternatives to Lecturing Medical Students to Death.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah School of Medicine. ED 233 623. 33 pages.

5. **Using Student Evaluations to Improve Teaching.**

   a. Aleamoni, L. M. The Usefulness of Student Evaluations in Improving College Teaching. *Instructional Science*, 7, 1978, 95-105.
   This article shows how student rating evaluations, if combined with individual consulting sessions, help instructors to significantly improve their student ratings.

   b. Wilson, R. C. Improving Faculty Teaching: Effective Use of Student Evaluations and Consultants. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1986, 57, 196-211.
   This article describes a consultation process which, when combined with feedback from student ratings, can produce positive change in instructors.

6. **Growth Contracting.**

   Simpson, E. & Oggel, T. Growth Contracting for Faculty Development. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development. *Idea Paper No. 11.* Kansas State University, 1984.
   This paper describes the concept of growth contracting to facilitate professional development.

7. **Teaching Goals Inventory.**

   a. Cross, P. K., Teaching "For" Learning. Paper presented at the North Carolina State University Centennial Year Provost's Forum. Raleigh, NC, 1987. ERIC Document No. 280537.

   b. Cross, P. K., & Fideler, E. F. Assessment in the Classroom. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, v 12, no. 4, 1988, 275-285.

8. **Small Group Instructional Diagnosis.**

Clark, J., & Redmond, M. Small Group Instructional Diagnosis. *Innovation Abstracts*, Vol. IV, no. 18, 1982. For further information write: Center for Instructional Development and Research
Parrington Hall DC-07
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

9. **How to Write Instructional Objectives and Properly Assess Student Learning Outcomes.**

Aleamoni, L. M., & Arreola, R. A. *A Practical Guide for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes. Measuring, Evaluating, and Grading Student Learning and Instructional Outcomes.* This book is provided at the workshop on Assessing Learning Outcomes. The workshop is conducted as a one day pre-session to the workshop on developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation program. For workshop dates and costs write:

CODES
6730 N. Camino Padre Isidoro
Tucson, AZ 85718
Phone (901) 682-9761

This workshop and workbook, appropriate for new and experienced faculty members, presents practical procedures and resource materials on how to more validly and reliably measure, evaluate, and grade student learning. Rarely do faculty have this opportunity to learn the techniques and methods of instructional design and learning outcomes assessment.

10. **Critical Thinking.**

Kurfiss, J. G. *Critical Thinking: Theory, Research Practice, and Possibilities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2, Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1988. What college teachers can do to foster critical thinking and intellectual development in students.

11. **Improving Instructional Delivery.**

a. Instructional Skills Workshop. The ISW workshops help develop and improve the skills of writing instructional objectives, preparing lesson plans, designing assessment strategies, and conducting instructional sessions. The workshops are designed for a one to five facilitator-participant ratio. Beginning and experienced instructors will benefit. Individuals are trained so they can facilitate ISW workshops at their own institution. Further information about the Instructional Skills Workshop program can be obtained through the office of:

Charles Miller
Santa Rosa Junior College
1501 Mendocino Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

b. Peer observations. Peer observation is appropriate for the instructional delivery aspect of teaching. The faculty development staff could request the help of instructors who have excellent teaching reputations. Our best teachers are a valuable resource which we should tap. Besides helping instructors to improve their instructional delivey, promoting an open visitation agreement among faculty could promote a great deal of positive sharing about teaching. Our grant experience taught us that instructors especially enjoy watching their colleagues teach.

c. Videotaping lectures. An instructional development person who is available to videotape a class and review it in confidence with the teacher could prove very helpful. Many college speech departments have videotape equipment.

PART IV. PROJECT DOCUMENTS AND INSTRUMENTS

VI. PROJECT DOCUMENTS AND INSTRUMENTS

Index To Documents and Instruments

Document letter — page

A. Memo sent to recruit instructors for participation.....39

B. Application to participate in the project.....42

C. Packet sent to participating instructors.....44

D. Peer observation instrument (in-house design).....49

E. Student rating instrument (in-house design).....53

F. Faculty observation report (in-house design).....58

G. Memo sent to recruit instructors for spring pilot.....59

H. Participant's option selection form.....63

I. Peer observation instrument-checklist.....65

J. Student rating instrument (Scantron version).....74

K. Typical student rating summary (Scantron version).....77

L. Small Group Individual Diagnosis Method (SGID).....79

DOCUMENT A: memo sent to recruit instructors for participation.

TO: ALL FULL-TIME FACULTY

FROM: Jerry Rudmann 10-12-89
Peer Observation FII Grant Coordinator

SUBJECT: **RECRUITMENT OF INSTRUCTORS FOR PEER OBSERVATION PROJECT**

BACKGROUND

Irvine Valley College has been awarded an FII grant (88-0517) titled "Peer Observation Pilot: An Analysis of Classroom Effectiveness." It is anticipated that this project will achieve two aims. First, the project will facilitate among faculty a greater interest in sharing and discussing how they conduct their teaching. Hopefully, following participation in the project many faculty will be motivated to try various teaching methods and ideas with the intent of improving their teaching effectiveness. Students should directly benefit from any positive changes in their instructor's teaching. The enthusiasm generated by instructors participating in the project may very well "spill over" to those faculty who do not participate.

Secondly, the project will help us implement AB1725 which mandates the use of peer and student feedback as part of the contractual process by which instructors are evaluated. It is highly likely that some form of the peer observer and student feedback process developed for this project will be incorporated in our college's response to the AB1725 requirements.

Currently, IVC does not have a standardized, efficient system for collecting peer and student feedback about instructors and courses. What information we currently collect isn't very useful for acknowledging good teaching or providing constructive feedback about teaching.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

For their participation in the process outlined below (see "SPECIFICS"), instructors each will be awarded a stipend of $320. The stipend is an incentive for participation in this pilot test. The grant has a pool of $8,640 allocated to pay instructors for participating in this pilot test. **At one $320 stipend per participant who completes a full cycle of participation as outlined below, we can involve 27 instructors** ($8640/$320= 27 instructors; 9 in the fall semester of 1989 and 18 in the spring of 1990). There may be some instructors who participate in the fall cycle as well as the spring cycle; these instructors will receive an additional $320 stipend for the spring semester participation.

SPECIFICS

SEQUENCE FOR PARTICIPATING INSTRUCTORS

- Attend a brief orientation/informational meeting.
- Attend the classroom of a colleague (target instructor) and complete the peer observation form.
- At the end of the classroom observation, administer and collect student feedback forms. Give target instructor a self-evaluation form.
- Meet with another instructor who has attended a different class to observe the same target instructor. Discuss observations and student data with the second observer.
- Meet with the target instructor and the second observer

to review the observation forms, the self-evaluation and the summarized student feedback.

- o Repeat the above cycle with another instructor as the target for peer observation.
- o Be a target instructor who is observed by two colleagues of his/her choice. A follow-up meeting with the two observers will be required to discuss the observations.
- o Each participant now completes an evaluation of the entire process. Changes and suggestions to the process will be welcome. Each participant must be available for an informal interview by a member of the Academic Affairs committee, whose charge is to develop a peer and tenure review process which conforms to AB1725 guidelines.

Each participating instructor will be given some options regarding the exact process by which peer observations and student feedback data are obtained. For example, some participants may wish to substitute some form of class interview for the student rating. Others may wish to have the class videotaped as part of the self-evaluation procedure. More on this at the orientation meeting.

In summary, each participant will observe the classroom instruction of two other instructors, and attend each of the follow-up meetings with each of the two instructors. Finally, each participant will be observed by two colleagues. To simplify the logistics, we will group participants into triads in which each member will observe and be observed by the others. Therefore, to successfully participate you must be willing and able to allocate, during November, a total of eight hours of your time. Your reward will be a $320 stipend and any benefits derived from observing and being observed by your colleagues and rated by your students.

The orientation meeting will be held before the end of Oct. The fall semester pilot will take place during November.

PLEASE LET ME KNOW AT ONCE IF YOU WISH TO PARTICIPATE. THE FIRST NINE INSTRUCTORS WHO CONTACT ME WILL BE THOSE WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR THIS SEMESTER'S PILOT. RESERVE A PLACE BY COMPLETING THE ATTACHED FORM AND PLACING IT IN MY MAIL FOLDER.

Thank you. I'm looking forward to working with you.

DOCUMENT B: application to participate in the project.

PEER OBSERVATION GRANT PROJECT

PEER OBSERVATION AND STUDENT FEEDBACK PILOT GRANT PROJECT

Yes, I would like to participate in the project this November.
I realize that my participation will require a total of eight hours.
I am aware that I will receive a $320 stipend for my full participation.

NAME_____
OFFICE PHONE_____
HOME PHONE_____

DOCUMENT C: packet sent to participating instructors.

THIS IS YOUR PEER OBSERVATION PACKET

INSTRUCTOR YOU WILL OBSERVE:_____
(observations to be conducted Monday, November 13 through Friday, December 1.)

INSTRUCTOR CAN BE REACHED AT:_____

NAME OF COURSE YOU WILL OBSERVE:_____

DAY OF OBSERVATION:_____

CLASS MEETS IN ROOM:_____

ENCLOSED ARE THE FOLLOWING:

1. an observation form you are to complete when you observe the class;

2. a prepared statement to read to the students prior to administering the student rating form;

3. a set of student rating forms;

4. a project sequence/checklist.

After the observation, please return all materials to the envelope. Leave the envelope with Jerry Rudmann or deposit it into the plastic tray on the wall outside Jerry's office.

MATCHUPS FOR THE FALL 1989 PEER PILOT

TO: All Peer Observation Pilot Test Participants

FROM: Jerry Rudmann, Project Coordinator

(Note: as you will see from the list below, I mostly avoided observer/evaluee matchups. This arrangement more closely simulates a typical peer review process.)

EVALUEE	OBSERVER 1	OBSERVER 2
Mark McNeil	Pat Bell	Kate Clark
Chris Riegle	Jan Horn	Eliz Mulholland
Terry Thorpe	Susan Long	Kate Clark
Richard Prytowsky	Chris Riegle	Jan Horn
Pat Bell	Eliz Mulholland	Susan Long
Eliz Mulholland	Pat Bell	Terry Thorpe
Kate Clark	Richard Prytowsky	Chris Riegle
Susan Long	Richard Prytowsky	Mark McNeil
Jan Horn	Mark McNeil	Terry Thorpe

If you want to veto one of your match-ups, see me immediately.

TIMELINES

OBSERVATION PACKETS HAVING OBSERVATION FORMS AND STUDENT RATING FORMS WILL BE PLACED INTO YOUR MAIL FOLDER:	Monday, Nov. 13
CONDUCT YOUR TWO CLASSROOM VISITATIONS:	Monday, Nov. 13 to Friday, Dec. 1
CONFERENCES (1 conference with each of two instructors you observed, and 1 conference with those who observed you):	Monday, Dec. 4 to Friday, Dec. 15
COMPLETE A SURVEY ABOUT THE PILOT TEST:	Final Exam Period
ATTEND SPRING IN-SERVICE TO OFFER YOUR COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, EXPERIENCES:	In-service Week

SEQUENCE/CHECKLIST

1. Arrange a time with the evaluee to visit his/her class.

2. Visit the class during the Nov. 13 to Dec. 1 period. While observing the class, complete the observation form.

3. After 60 minutes of observation, excuse the instructor.

4. Read to the students the statement about the student ratings.

5. Administer the student rating forms. Ask students to use only pencils on the scantron forms.

6. Collect the forms, place them into the envelope and deliver them to Jerry Rudmann for processing.

7. Notify the other observer that you have completed your observation.

8. As soon as you are notified that the student ratings have been processed, meet with the co-observer and prepare for the eventual conference with the evaluee. During this meeting compare your respective observations and review the student feedback summaries.

9. During the period of Dec. 4 to Dec. 15, meet with the co-observer and the evaluee for the evaluation conference. At this conference, review all materials. Complete the observation conference form.

10. Place all materials in the envelope and return to Jerry Rudmann for storage.

11. During final exam week, complete the project evaluation survey.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE PEER OBSERVER

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IS TO BE READ TO STUDENTS PRIOR TO DISTRIBUTING THE STUDENT RATING FORMS:

You are being asked to evaluate this class as part of a voluntary process initiated by the faculty at this campus. This process is intended to provide the instructor with information about the effectiveness of the class presentation. You instructor has volunteered to meet with other faculty members to discuss the results of these evaluations. Please use the scantron provided and a pencil for completing pages 1 and 2. For the comment section, page 3, you may write directly on the page. Please be objective in your assessment.

DOCUMENT D: peer observation instrument (in-house design).

IRVINE VALLEY COLLEGE

FACULTY OBSERVATION REPORT

Contract Faculty ☐ Regular Faculty ☐

Instructor _____ Date of Visit _____

Course ID No. _____ Ticket No. _____

Panel Member No. 1 Panel Member No. 2 (if applicable)

Summary of Lesson Content _____

Instructional Assessment	Comments and Suggestions
I. Classroom Observation	
1. Exhibits subject matter expertise.	
2. Presents material in a manner that students understand.	
3. Uses a variety of instructional techniques and aids.	
4. Effectively engages the student in the class (e.g. whole class discussion, individual student participation, group work.	
5. Provides students with a syllabus which clearly defines the nature and scope of the class, the grading criteria, and what is expected of students.	

FACULTY OBSERVATION REPORT

Instructional Assessment	Comments and Suggestions
6. Presents a skillfully organized class session.	
7. Manages class time effectively.	
8. Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject matter and for teaching.	
9. Uses teaching methods appropriate to subject.	

Instructional Assessment	Comments and Suggestions
II. Professional Involvement	
1. How do you stay current in field?	
2. How do you participate in the life and activities of the college outside the classroom (i.e., committees, community work).	

FACULTY OBSERVATION REPORT

Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐ Date of Conference _____

Remarks by Instructor _____

Additional Comments by Observer(s) _____

_____ _____
Signature of Observer Date

_____ _____
Signature of Observer Date

DOCUMENT E: student rating instrument (in-house design).

IRVINE VALLEY COLLEGE

STUDENT OBSERVATION OF INSTRUCTION

Your instructor has volunteered to participate in this process. It is intended to provide the instructor with information that will help him/her evaluate and/or improve the course.

Directions: Please place your answers on the Scantron Answer Form. DO NOT WRITE ON THIS FORM!

Part 1: Student Information

1. Student Level:
   - A. ☐ Lower Division (Freshman or Sophomore Standing)
   - B. ☐ Upper Division (Junior or Senior Standing)
   - C. ☐ Graduate (Have Earned a Bachelor's Degree)
2. Student Type:
   - A. ☐ Full-Time Student (I Have a 12 Unit Load or More This Semester)
   - B. ☐ Part-Time Student (I Have Fewer Than 12 Units This Semester)
3. Your reason for taking this course: (check only one)
   - A. ☐ General Education
   - B. ☐ Elective
   - C. ☐ Major
   - D. ☐ Pre-requisite
   - E. ☐ Other

Part 2: Instructor Observations

Please use the following scale to answer items 4 through 20:

A = Strongly Agree
B = Agree
C = Neutral
D = Disagree
E = Strong Disagree

4. Instructor clearly outlined objectives for this course.
5. Instructor communicates subject matter effectively.
6. Instructor creates interest in subject and motivates students to learn.
7. Instructor organizes class time well.
8. Instructor is skillful in observing student reactions.
9. The organization of this course helps students learn.
10. Instructor usually plans the activities of each class period in detail.
11. Instructor tells students when they have done a particularly good job.
12. Instructor criticizes poor work.
13. In the class I feel free to express my opinions.
14. The other students often volunteer their own opinions.
15. The instructor listens attentively to what class members have to say.
16. Instructor is well prepared for each class.
17. Instructor's feedback (written comments, explanatory handouts) are helpful in meeting the standards of the course.
18. Testing and grading are fair and appropriately reflected course materials.

STUDENT OBSERVATION OF INSTRUCTION

19. Would you advise another student to take a course from this instructor?

A Strong Yes
B Yes
C Indifferent
D No
E Strong No

20. Compared to other college courses, the level of difficulty was:

A Very Difficult
B Somewhat Difficult
C About Right
D Somewhat Elementary
E Very Elementary

21. Compared to other college courses, the workload was:

A Very Heavy
B Heavy
C Average
D Light
E Very Light

22. Compared to other college courses, the pace of this course was:

A Very Fast
B Fast
C Average
D Slow
E Very Slow

23. Compared to other college instructors, how effective has the instructor been in this course?

A One of the most effective (top 20 percent)
B More effective than average (60-80 percent)
C About average (40-60 percent)
D Less effective than average (20-40 percent)
E One of the least effective (lowest 20 percent)

24. Your grade expected for this course.

A B C D F

25. Indicate the grade which most closely corresponds to your overall G.P.A.

A B C D F

26. The amount of time and effort I have put into this course was:

A. Not much.
B. Less than average.
C. Average amount.
D. More than most courses.

Additional Questions for Your Instructor to Add (If Desired)

27.

28.

29.

30.

STUDENT OBSERVATION OF INSTRUCTION

Part 3: Comments

Please look over the five questions below, then select any two (2) questions. Write your comments below to the two questions you selected.

1. Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he/she has done especially well in teaching this course.
2. Your instructor would like to know what specific things you believe might be done to improve the teaching in this course.
3. Your instructor would like to know how you feel about the textbook or other reading materials.
4. Was your instructor readily available for consultation?
5. Do you have any further comments that you feel would be helpful? (Following is a list of specific areas that you may wish to comment on, but feel free to comment on anything.)

Exams	Disruptiveness of Other Students
Office Hours	Attitude of Instructor Toward Students
Grading Promptness	Breadth or Narrowness of Topics
Instructor Knowledge	Value of Classroom Discussion
Tone/Atmosphere of Classroom	Anything Else?
Comfort Level of Classroom	Number of Cancelled Class Meetings

Question ___. My comments are:

Question ___. My comments are:

0403
Rev: 11/8/8'
FM2P9.028

DOCUMENT F: faculty observation report (in-house design).

FACULTY OBSERVATION REPORT

Full-Time Faculty ☐ Part-Time Faculty ☐

Instructor _____ Date of Report _____

School _____

_____ _____
Panel Member No. 1 Area/Division/Instructional Unit

_____ _____
Panel Member No. 2 Area/Division/Instructional Unit

1. Brief description of evaluation procedures; e.g., classroom observation, conference, written report, student evaluation.

2. Classroom Observation.

3. Professional Involvement.

4. Observation From Student Evaluations.

DOCUMENT G: memo sent to recruit instructors for spring pilot.

TO: ALL FULL-TIME FACULTY OF THE SADDLEBACK COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

FROM: Jerry Rudmann
Psychology Instructor at IVC,

Coordinator of FII grant to study peer evaluation and methods of gathering student feedback about instruction

DATE: 2-9-90

SUBJECT: RECRUITMENT OF INSTRUCTORS FOR PEER OBSERVATION PROJECT

BACKGROUND

I have been awarded an FII grant (88-0517) titled "Peer Observation Pilot: An Analysis of Classroom Effectiveness." It is anticipated that this project will achieve three aims. First, the project will facilitate among faculty a greater interest in sharing and discussing how they conduct their teaching. Hopefully, following participation in the project many faculty will be motivated to try various teaching methods and ideas with the intent of improving student learning. Students should directly benefit from any positive changes in their instructor's teaching. The enthusiasm generated by instructors participating in the project may very well "spill over" to those faculty who do not participate.

Secondly, as you know, AB1725 mandates the use of peer observation and strongly suggests the use of student feedback as part of the contractual process by which instructors are evaluated. *The grant provides us with an excellent opportunity to evaluate models of peer observation and student feedback.* Possibly some form of the peer observer and student feedback process developed for this project will be incorporated in our district's response to the AB1725 requirements.

Third, currently the district does not have a standardized, efficient system for collecting student feedback about instructors and courses. Let's remedy this problem.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

For their participation in the process outlined below (see "SPECIFICS"), instructors each will be awarded a stipend of $320. The stipend is an incentive for participation in this pilot test. The grant has a pool allocated to pay instructors for participating in this pilot test. At one $320 stipend per participant who completes a full cycle of participation as outlined below, we can involve 20 instructors during the spring.

SPECIFICS:
SEQUENCE FOR PARTICIPATING INSTRUCTORS

- o Attend a brief orientation/informational meeting.
- o Attend the classroom of a colleague (target instructor) and complete the peer observation form.
- o At the end of the classroom observation, administer and collect student feedback forms. Give target instructor a self-evaluation form to complete at his or her leisure.
- o Meet briefly with a second instructor who also has observed the target instructor. Compare notes regarding what you have observed and anything of interest from the student feedback summaries.
- o Along with a co-observer, meet with the target instructor to review the observation forms, the self-evaluation and the summarized student feedback. Complete and sign the final conference document.
- o Repeat the above cycle with another instructor serving as the target instructor.
- o Repeat the above cycle but reverse roles. You become the evaluee and your colleagues becomes the peer observers.
- o Each participant now completes an evaluation of the entire process. Changes and suggestions to the process will be welcome.

Each participating instructor will be given some options regarding the exact process by which peer observation and student feedback data are obtained. For example, some participants may wish to substitute a class interview for gathering student feedback. Others may wish to have the class videotaped as part of the self-evaluation procedure. More on this at the orientation meeting.

In summary, each participant will observe the classroom instruction of two other instructors, collect student feedback, and attend a follow-up meeting with each target instructor. Finally, each participant will be observed, by two colleagues. Therefore, to successfully participate you must be willing and able to allocate, during this semester, about 7.5 hours of your time. Your reward will be a $320 stipend and any benefits derived from observing and being observed by a colleague and rated by your students.

The orientation meeting will be on Friday, March 2nd at 9 a.m. at IVC, and 11 a.m. at Saddleback (room location to be announced). I will make special arrangements for those who cannot meet on a Friday morning.

Please let me know if you wish to participate. The first 20 instructors who volunteer will be eligible for this pilot.

Thank you. I'm looking forward to working with you. I hope you share my excitement over the grant project. If you wish to participate, please complete and return the attached form.

PEER OBSERVATION AND STUDENT FEEDBACK PILOT GRANT PROJECT

Yes, I would like to participate in the project this semester.
I realize that my participation will require about 7.5 hours and will earn a $320 stipend.

NAME_____
OFFICE PHONE_____
HOME PHONE_____

DOCUMENT H: participant option selection form.

FII GRANT: PEER OBSERVATION/STUDENT FEEDBACK PILOT TEST

PARTICIPANT OPTION SELECTION

NAME_____

During March, each participant will visit the class of two colleagues. During the same period, two colleagues will visit, observe, and collect student feedback in the class of each participant. When you serve as an instructor being observed, which of the following options would you prefer:

PEER OBSERVATION FORM:

A) Short form used in fall of 1989 ____
B) Longer, experimental checklist form ____
C) I would prefer both forms be used ____

STUDENT FEEDBACK METHOD:

A) Scantron form (students make ratings and open-ended comments) ____
B) Peer conducted discussion process ____
C) I would prefer methods A and B ____

SELF EVALUATION FORM:

A) Instructor Self-Evaluation Form (ISEF) ____
B) Teaching Goals Inventory ____
C) I would prefer both A & B ____

*NOTE: If you would like to try the Teaching Goals Inventory, will need to complete it SOON for each type of course in which you will be observed. As soon as you have completed it, send it to me so I can develop customized questions for your student feedback and/or peer conducted class interview process. Send to:

Jerry Rudmann
Social Science
IVC, A/228

DOCUMENT I: peer observation instrument-checklist.

PEER PILOT GRANT, SPRING 1990

CLASS OBSERVATION FORM: PEER PILOT GRANT, 1990

D I R E C T I O N S

Respond to each of the statements below by checking the number which best expressed your judgment.

(1) = strength (2) = somewhat of a problem (3) = a major problem (4) = not applicable

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
___	___	___	___	1. The material presented is generally accepted by colleagues to be worth knowing.
___	___	___	___	2. The material presented is important for this group of students.
___	___	___	___	3. The instructor seemed to match the lecture material to the student's background.
___	___	___	___	4. The examples used were easily understood by students.
___	___	___	___	5. When appropriate, a distinction was made between factual material and opinions.
___	___	___	___	6. Appropriate, authorities were cited to support statements.
___	___	___	___	7. When appropriate divergent viewpoints were presented.
___	___	___	___	8. A sufficient amount of material was included in the lecture.

OTHER COMMENTS _____

PEER PILOT GRANT, SPRING 1990

CONTENT: ORGANIZATION

D I R E C T I O N S

Respond to each of the statements below by checking the number which best expressed your judgment.

(1) = strength (2) = somewhat of a problem (3) = a major problem (4) = not applicable

---

INTRODUCTION

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
___	___	___	___	1. Stated the purpose of the lecture.
___	___	___	___	2. Presented a brief overview of the lecture content.
___	___	___	___	3. Stated a problem to be solved or discussed during the lecture.
___	___	___	___	4. Made explicit the relationship between today's and the previous lecture.

BODY OF LECTURE

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
___	___	___	___	5. Arranged and discussed the content so that the organization/structure was made explicit to the students.
___	___	___	___	6. Asked questions periodically to determine whether too much or too little information was being presented.
___	___	___	___	7. Presented examples, illustrations or graphics to clarify abstract and difficult ideas.
___	___	___	___	8. Explicit stated the relationships among various ideas in the lecture.
___	___	___	___	9. Periodically summarized the most important ideas in the lecture.

CONCLUSION

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
___	___	___	___	10. Solved or otherwise dealt with any problems raised during the lecture.
___	___	___	___	11. Restated what students were expected to gain from the lecture material.
___	___	___	___	12. Related the day's lecture to upcoming presentations.

OTHER COMMENTS _____

PEER PILOT GRANT, SPRING 1990

PRESENTATION: STYLE

DIRECTIONS

Respond to each of the statements below by checking the number which best expressed your judgment.

(1) = strength (2) = somewhat of a problem (3) = a major problem (4) = not applicable

---

VOICE CHARACTERISTICS

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
___	___	___	___	1.	Voice could be easily heard.
___	___	___	___	2.	Voice was raised or lowered for variety and emphasis.
___	___	___	___	3.	Speech was neither too formal nor too casual.
___	___	___	___	4.	Speech fillers, ("okay now," "ahm,") were not distracting.
___	___	___	___	5.	Rate of speech was neither too fast nor too slow.

NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
___	___	___	___	6.	Established and maintained eye contact with the class as lecture began.
___	___	___	___	7.	Listened carefully to student's comments and questions.
___	___	___	___	8.	Wasn't too stiff and formal in appearance.
___	___	___	___	9.	Wasn't too casual in appearance. lecture.
___	___	___	___	10.	Facial and body movements were consistent with instructor's intentions. For example, the instructor looked at students while waiting for their responses after asking questions.

OTHER COMMENTS _____

PEER PILOT GRANT, SPRING 1990

PRESENTATION: CLARITY

DIRECTIONS

Respond to each of the statements below by checking the number which best expressed your judgment.

(1) = strength (2) = somewhat of a problem (3) = a major problem (4) = not applicable

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
—	—	—	—	1. Stated the purpose at the beginning of the lecture.
—	—	—	—	2. Defined new terms, concepts, and principles.
—	—	—	—	3. Told the students why certain processes, techniques or formulas were used to solve problems.
—	—	—	—	4. Used relevant examples to explain major ideas.
—	—	—	—	5. Used clear an simple examples.
—	—	—	—	6. Explicitly related new ideas to familiar ones.
—	—	—	—	7. Reiterated definitions of new terms to help students become accustomed to them.
—	—	—	—	8. Provided occasional summaries and restatements of important ideas.
—	—	—	—	9. Used alternate explanations when necessary.
—	—	—	—	10. Slowed the word flow when ideas were complex and difficult.
—	—	—	—	11. Did not often digress from the main topic.
—	—	—	—	12. Talked to the class, not to the board or windows.
—	—	—	—	13. The board work appeared organized and legible.

OTHER COMMENTS _____

PEER PILOT GRANT, SPRING 1990

QUESTIONING SKILLS

DIRECTIONS

Respond to each of the statements below by checking the number which best expressed your judgment.

(1) = strength (2) = somewhat of a problem (3) = a major problem (4) = not applicable

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
—	—	—	—	1. Asked questions to see what the students knew about the lecture topic.
—	—	—	—	2. Addressed questions to individual students as well as the group at large.
—	—	—	—	3. Used rhetorical questions to gain students' attention.
—	—	—	—	4. Paused after all questions to allow students time to think of an answer.
—	—	—	—	5. Encouraged students to answer difficult questions by providing cues or rephrasing.
—	—	—	—	6. When necessary, asked students to clarify their questions.
—	—	—	—	7. Asked probing questions if a student's answer was incomplete or superficial.
—	—	—	—	8. Repeated answers when necessary to the entire class could hear.
—	—	—	—	9. Received students' questions politely and when possible enthusiastically.
—	—	—	—	10. Requested that questions which required time-consuming answers of limited interest be discussed before or after class or during office hours.

OTHER COMMENTS _____

PEER PILOT GRANT, SPRING 1990

ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING CONTACT WITH STUDENTS

QUESTIONING SKILLS

DIRECTIONS

Respond to each of the statements below by checking the number which best expressed your judgment.

(1) = strength (2) = somewhat of a problem (3) = a major problem (4) = not applicable

---

ESTABLISHING CONTACT

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
___	___	___	___	1. Greeted students with a bit of small talk.
___	___	___	___	2. Established eye contact with as many students as possible.
___	___	___	___	3. Set ground rules for student participation and questioning.
___	___	___	___	4. Used questions to gain student attention.
___	___	___	___	5. Encouraged student questions.

MAINTAINING CONTACT

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
___	___	___	___	6. Maintained eye contact with as many students as possible.
___	___	___	___	7. Used rhetorical questions to re-engage student attention.
___	___	___	___	8. Asked questions which allowed the instructor to gauge students' progress.
___	___	___	___	9. Was able to answer student's questions satisfactorily.
___	___	___	___	10. Noted and responded to signs of puzzlement, boredom, curiosity, etc.
___	___	___	___	11. Varied the pace of the lecture to keep students alert.
___	___	___	___	12. Spoke at a rate which allowed students time to take notes.

OTHER COMMENTS _____

APPENDIX J

EVALUATION OF COURSE MATERIALS

Listed below are several items about course materials categorized into three major areas. For each item, indicate on a five-point scale (1-5 with 5 being high), the extent to which the course meets the criteria as represented by each item.

COURSE ORGANIZATION

___ 1. The syllabus adequately outlines the sequence of topics to be covered.
___ 2. The stated course objectives are clear.
___ 3. The outline and sequence of topics is logical.
___ 4. The difficulty level is appropriate for the enrolled students.
___ 5. The course integrates recent developments in the field.
___ 6. Time given to each of the major course topics is appropriate.
___ 7. Course is responsive to the needs of students enrolled in the course.
___ 8. The course is an adequate prerequisite for other courses.
___ 9. The course objectives are congruent with the department curricula.

READINGS, PROJECTS, AND LABORATORY ASSIGNMENTS

___ 1. The reading list (required/recommended) is up to date and represents the work of recognized authorities.
___ 2. Readings are appropriate for level of course.
___ 3. The texts used in the course are well selected.
___ 4. Students are given ample time to complete the assignments/take home exams.
___ 5. The amount of homework and assignments is appropriate.
___ 6. The written assignments and projects are carefully chosen to reflect course goals.
___ 7. A variety of assignments is available to meet individual student needs.
___ 8. Laboratory work is integrated into the course.
___ 9. Students are given the course requirements in writing at the beginning of the course.
___ 10. The assignments are intellectually challenging to the students.

PEER PILOT GRANT, SPRING 1990

EXAMS AND GRADING

___ 1. The exam content is representative of the content and course objectives.

___ 2. The exam items are clear and well written.

___ 3. The exams are graded in a fair manner.

___ 4. The grade distribution is appropriate for level of course and type of students enrolled.

___ 5. The standards used for grading are communicated to the students.

DOCUMENT J: student rating instrument (Scantron version).

ParSURVEY™

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION
(IEI MODULE)

SCCD: PEER OBSERVATION/STUDENT FEEDBACK (FII GRANT PROJECT)

Your instructor has volunteered to participate in this process. It is intended to provide the instructor with information that will help him/her evaluate and/or improve the course.

Questions 1-20 apply to the instructor and course.
Mark over the block number (at right) the number that follows your evaluation, using the following scale for Questions 1-20:

Strongly Agree(5) Agree(4) No Opinion(3)
Disagree(2) Strongly Disagree(1)

	SA	A	NO	D	SD
Instructor clearly outlined objectives for this course	1	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor communicates subject matter effectively	2	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor creates interest in subject and motivates students to learn	3	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor organizes class time well	4	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor is skillful in observing student reactions	5	5	4	3	2	1
The organization of this course helps students learn	6	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor usually plans the activities of each class period in detail	7	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor tells students when they have done a particularly good job	8	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor criticizes poor work	9	5	4	3	2	1
In the class I feel free to express my opinions	10	5	4	3	2	1
The other students often volunteer their own opinions	11	5	4	3	2	1
The instructor listens attentively to what class members have to say	12	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor is well prepared for each class	13	5	4	3	2	1
Instructor's feedback is helpful in meeting the standards of the course	14	5	4	3	2	1
Testing and grading are fair and appropriately reflect course materials	15	5	4	3	2	1
I would advise another student to take a course from this instructor	16	5	4	3	2	1

Course level is:	Very Difficult(5)	Difficult(4)	Average(3)	Light(2)	Very Light(1)	17
Course workload is:	Very Heavy(5)	Heavy(4)	Average(3)	Light(2)	Very Light(1)	18
Course pace is:	Very Fast(5)	Fast(4)	Average(3)	Slow(2)	Very Slow(1)	19
This instructor is:	One of Best(5)	Above Average(4)	Average(3)	Below Average(2)	Poor(1)	20

Questions 27-32 apply to you, your educational status, and your reasons for taking course:

I am/have a:	Freshman/Sophomore(5)	Junior/Senior(4)	Earned a Bachelor's Degree(3)			27
I am currently:	Full-Time - 12 or more units(5)	Part-Time - Less than 12 units(4)				28
Taking this course for:	General Ed(5)	Elective(4)	Major(3)	Pre-requisite(2)	Other(1)	29
The grade you expect for this course is:	A(5)	B(4)	C(3)	D(2)	F(1)	30
The grade closest to your overall G.P.A.:	A(5)	B(4)	C(3)	D(2)	F(1)	31
My time/effort in this course compared with others:	More(5)	Average(4)	Little(3)			32

33 34 35

36 A) 0 1 2 3
B) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

37 A) 0 1 2 3
B) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

© ECONOMICS RESEARCH, INC. 1987

SCCD: PEER OBSERVATION/STUDENT FEEDBACK (FII GRANT PROJECT)

Additional Questions for Your Instructor to Add (If Desired)

27. _____

28. _____

29. _____

30. _____

Please look over the five questions below, then select any two (2) questions. Write your comments below to the two questions you selected.

1. Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he/she has done especially well in teaching this course.

2. Your instructor would like to know what specific things you believe might be done to improve the teaching in this course.

3. Your instructor would like to know how you feel about the textbook or other reading materials.

4. Was your instructor readily available for consultation?

5. Do you have any further comments that you feel would be helpful? (Following is a list of specific areas that you may wish to comment on, but feel free to comment on anything.)

Exams	Disruptiveness of Other Students
Office Hours	Attitude of Instructor Toward Students
Grading Promptness	Breadth or Narrowness of Topics
Instructor Knowledge	Value of Classroom Discussion
Tone/Atmosphere of Classroom	Anything Else?
Comfort Level of Classroom	Number of Cancelled Class Meetings

Question ___. My comments are:

Question ___. My comments are:

DOCUMENT K: typical student rating summary (Scantron version).

Saddleback Community College District
FII Grant: Student Feedback Pilot Test

Course: 12
Course Desc.: Acct 1B
Instructor:

Year: 90
Semester: Sp
Inst. No.: 012

Class Enrollment: 0
Class Respondents: 13

School Enroll.: 89
School Resp.: 539

Question	Course 5 Hi #	5 Hi %	4 %	3 %	2 %	1 Lo	Omit #	Resp #	Str %	Weak %	Mean	S.D.	%-tile	School Str %	School Weak %	School Mean	School S.D.
1 Clearly outlined course objectives.	45	55	0	0	0		2	11	0	0	4.5	0.5	62	0	0	4.3	0.9
2 Effectively communicates sub-matter	8	38	23	31	0		0	13	0	0	3.2	1.0	3	0	0	4.2	0.9
3 Creates interest motivates to learn	17	58	8	17	0		1	12	0	0	3.8	0.9	14	0	0	4.3	0.9
4 Organizes class time well.....	15	31	8	31	15		0	13	0	0	3.0	1.4	5	0	0	4.0	1.0
5 Skill in observing stdnt reactions.	23	69	0	8	0		0	13	0	0	4.1	0.7	27	0	0	4.3	0.8
6 Course organization helps learning.	8	31	38	15	8		0	13	0	0	3.2	1.0	5	0	0	4.0	0.9
7 Class activities planned in detail.	15	8	46	23	8		0	13	0	0	3.0	1.1	7	0	0	3.9	1.0
8 Tells students when have done well.	77	23	0	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.8	0.4	96	0	0	4.1	0.9
9 Criticizes poor work.....	0	15	23	23	38		0	13	0	0	2.2	1.1	17	0	0	2.6	1.2
10 I feel free to express my opinion..	23	62	15	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.1	0.6	16	0	0	4.4	0.8
11 Students often volunteer opinions..	46	46	8	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.4	0.6	57	0	0	4.3	0.8
12 Listens well to what students say..	15	69	15	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.0	0.6	4	0	0	4.6	0.7
13 Instructor well prepared for class.	8	31	38	8	15		0	13	0	0	3.1	1.1	2	0	0	4.2	0.9
14 Instructor's feedback helps.....	8	54	31	8	0		0	13	0	0	3.6	0.7	6	0	0	4.2	0.8
15 Testing, grading fair & appropriate	8	42	17	33	0		1	12	0	0	3.3	1.0	5	0	0	4.1	1.0
16 Advise others take this instructor?	0	42	33	17	8		1	12	0	0	3.1	1.0	2	0	0	4.3	1.0
17 Difficulty: 5=Vdiff 3=avg 1=Veasy..	23	54	23	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.0	0.7	69	0	0	3.6	0.8
18 Course load:5=Vheavy 3=avg 1=Vlight	46	31	23	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.2	0.8	90	0	0	3.4	1.0
19 Course pace:5=V fast 3=avg 1= Valow	23	69	8	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.2	0.5	90	0	0	3.6	0.8
20 Overall rating of the instructor...	8	38	46	8	0		0	13	0	0	3.5	0.7	5	0	0	4.2	0.8
21	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	4.2	0.8
22	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	4.0	0.9
23	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	4.2	0.9
24	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	4.0	0.0
25	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	5.0	0.0
26	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	0.0	0.0
27 class stndng:5=leudiv 4=updiv 3=gd	67	17	17	0	0		1	12	0	0	4.5	0.8	36	0	0	4.6	0.7
28 status:5=fulltime 4=parttime.....	58	42	0	0	0		1	12	0	0	4.6	0.5	47	0	0	4.6	0.6
29 course for:5=GE 4=elec 3=Ajr 2=ProR	8	8	54	8	23		0	13	0	0	2.7	1.1	24	0	0	3.3	1.3
30 expected grade:5=A 4=B 3=C 2=D 1=F.	62	31	8	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.5	0.6	74	0	0	4.3	0.7
31 Overall GPA is:5=A 4=B 3=C 2=D 1=F.	38	54	8	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.3	0.6	83	0	0	4.1	0.7
32 Effort spent: 5=more 4=avg 3=little	69	31	0	0	0		0	13	0	0	4.7	0.5	94	0	0	4.3	0.7
33	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	3.0	0.0
34	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	0.0	0.0
35	0	0	0	0	0		13	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		0	0	0.0	0.0

DOCUMENT L: Small Group Individual Diagnosis (SGID) method.

The Small Group Individual Diagnosis (SGID) Method

SGID is a five-step process involving the course instructor, students in the instructor's class, and a faculty colleague trained to act as a facilitator.

Step One. The initial step is a conference between the instructor and the facilitator in which the facilitator explains the SGID process and gets to know something about the instructor's style.

Step Two. The classroom procedure is scheduled for the middle of the term during a regular class meeting. The instructor teaches as usual for the first part of the period, then introduces the facilitator and leaves the room for the last 25 to 30 minutes. The facilitator briefly explains to the students his or her role and the SGID process, emphasizing that the information will be given only to the instructor and that the students have an opportunity to have direct affect on the remainder of their course. The facilitator then asks them to divide themselves into groups of about five and to select one person from each group to act as recorder and spokesperson.

The groups each address and arrive at a consensus on two questions.

1. What do you like about the course?
2. (A) What do you think needs improvement?
   (B) What suggestions do you have for bringing about these improvements?

After 7-8 minutes of discussion time, the facilitator asks each spokesperson to report one response to each of the questions (more than one round can be made if time and class size permit).

The facilitator writes the responses on the board, being sensitive to dissension and minority views. When a statement is not shared by most, the facilitator requests a show of hands and records the approximate breakdown. The instructor will ask for two student volunteers to record what is written on the board. The facilitator will share this information with the instructor.

Step Three. The next step in SGID is the feedback session between the facilitator and the instructor in which they discuss the students' comments, the instructor's reaction to them, and strategies for change. They also discuss what the instructor should say to the students.

This step has been identified as the most difficult in the process. It requires that the facilitator has adequate teaching experience and that he or she also possess a number of interpersonal skills; the facilitator should be supportive, warm, sensitive, understanding, nonjudgmental, and should listen actively.

The facilitator's role requires that he or she operates on several levels. On the first level, the facilitator is a communication channel with primary concern for conveying the students' sentiments in such a way as to avoid defensive reactions from the instructor that may block the flow of information.

On the second level, the facilitator is an information source, perhaps sharing his or her own teaching experiences or telling the instructor about various resources and techniques.

On the third level, which only should be incorporated by the most experienced, the facilitator gives possible interpretations of student reasoning and concerns. He or she may hypothesize about the instructor's teaching strategies for the instructor's reaction and reflection.

Step Four. In this step, the instructor uses the first 10 minutes of the ensuing class period to get clarification from students about comments that were unclear and summarize the students' comments to allow them to correct distortions and check for accuracy. The instructor should offer some reactions to the comments and perhaps outline intended changes or adaptations.

Step Five. The Instructor fills out the response form and forwards it to the facilitator. This step involves a follow-up session between the facilitator and the instructor to discuss the success of the review session with the students. The session should emphasize a self-evaluation by the instructor of how the changes are working as well as an analysis of the impact upon the students. This session should serve to reinforce the instructor's changes and improvements.

Step Six. The facilitator will attach a summary of the entire SGID process.

FACILITATOR REPORT

Instructor: _____ Semester: _____

Date of Visit: _____

Name of Facilitator: _____

Course Number & Title: _____

Number of Students Present: _____

Instructor's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Facilitator's Signature: _____

Date: _____

STUDENT COMMENTS:		
POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE CLASS	AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

PEER MENTOR PROCESS

Summary Comments of the SGID Facilitator

Please write a short summary of your impressions gained during the class visit and in your discussions with the instructor.

On November 23, 1988 I was an S.G.I.D. facilitator in English 501 class. It was a very productive experience, but also a difficult one. I say difficult only because there was so much disagreement among the students about what they disliked about the class.

Overall, they like the course and think their instructor is excellent. They emphasized that they thought that Mrs. was very fair and nonbiased and was always willing to help them. They liked the fact that she didn't attack them personally when she was correcting their mistakes and actually made them feel comfortable during the process. They thought that her methods of instruction were very innovative and that they all had a chance to participate in classroom discussions.

Their main criticisms were not about Mrs. but about the course itself and the lab. Sixteen out of 19 agreed that the pace of the course was too fast and that the lab needed improvement due to noise, crowdedness and personnel problems. As far as the other areas that needed improvement, there was quite a bit of disagreement and they couldn't reach a consensus (see attached report #4-6). During the evaluation they kept telling me to make sure that Mrs. "didn't take this personally"; they knew that the problems were not her fault.

Immediately following the S.G.I.D. I discussed this evaluation with and she was completely open and receptive to their suggestions. In fact, she thought that many of their ideas were good ones. Since then, she has met with the other 501 instructors to share some of her students' ideas, especially regarding assignments. She has also met with lab personnel to try to make some necessary changes there. I was particularly impressed with the fact that she immediately responded to these suggestions so that the course could be improved rather quickly.

It is obvious that is a conscientious and dedicated instructor who is really concerned about her students and their progress. And they, in turn, respect her for this. Over the years that I have been at Allan Hancock College I have heard good things about many of the English instructors, but I have heard a disproportionate number about . . . She certainly is an asset to her department and our college.

Signature of Facilitator Date

Signature of Instructor

FACILITATOR REPORT

Instructor: _____ Semester: Fall 1988

Instructor's Signature: _____

Date of Visit: November 23, 1988

Date: Nov 23, 1988

Name of Facilitator: _____

Facilitator's Signature: _____

Course Number & Title: English 501 - Introduction to Language Arts

Date: Nov 23, 1988

Number of Students Present: 19

STUDENT COMMENTS:

POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE CLASS	AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS
1. Teacher makes you feel comfortable when correcting mistakes. 2. Like working in editing groups and coming up with personal experiences in paragraphs. 3. Like methods used to write better paragraphs. 4. Class participation. 5. Like leisure reading (2 disagree) 6. Teacher gives a lot of individual attention. 7. Teacher is nonbiased. 8. Teacher is very innovative. 9. Like book talks (3 disagree) 10. Like note taking on other students (5 think just listening would be better). 11. Good pace (13 disagree)	1. Pace of course too fast. (3 disagree) 2. Lab need improvement (3 disagree). 3. 2 lab hours too many on weeks with 1 or 2 days holidays. 4. 4 books too many to read. (8 disagree) 5. Too much repetition at beginning of course. (pre-writing) (7 disagree) 6. Too many assignments given at one time, makes things confusing. (8 disagree)	1. Give fewer assignments. 2. Too crowded at times. Too noisy. Some lab personnel have attitude problems and are very rude to students. 3. Cut lab hours on holiday weeks. 4. Cut books assigned to 2. 5. Shorten time spent on pre-writing). 6. Even out assignments more.

INSTRUCTOR'S RESPONSE TO EVALUATION

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF STUDENTS' SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS	INSTRUCTOR'S RESPONSE	ACTION THE INSTRUCTOR WILL TAKE
1. Give fewer assignmeqts.	1. If students were referring to writing assignments, my response is, "Sorry, but basic writers need to write, write,write." However, in terms of study skills and assignments in reading/speaking/listening, perhaps we could back off.	1. I have already met with other 501 instructors about deleting or at least shortening some of the study skills lesson that didn't quite seem to work this semest We have decided to spread assignments out more evenly to lessen the confusion at the beginning.
2. Lab problems: 1. Too noisy. 2. Too crowded. 3. Some lab personnel have attitude problems & are very rude to students.	2. We are all guilty of creating the high noise level in the lab. I feel that instructors in general could be more professional. I agree about the over-crowding. I wasn't aware of the attitude problem.	2. I have discussed these lab issues with Nancy in the lab. I have also talked with other instructors & have heard there are similar complaints about lab personnel. I will be meeting shortly with Nancy, Carol, and Virginia to discuss the attitude issue
3. 2 lab hours are too many during holiday weeks.	3. I agree.	3. I have discussed this with Nancy. At our last comp/lit meeting she announced that only 1 hour will be required during short holiday weeks from now on.
4. Cut leisure reading books to 2. (8 disagree, however)	4. The students who complained have now caught up on their leisure reading. They have told me that they enjoyed their books. I really feel that more structured guidelines is what they want, including deadlines and info on book reports.	4. Next semester I will set deadlines so that the students don't find themselve at the end of the semester with 4 books t cram into their busy schedules. I'll al be more specific about book talks and reports, but the majority of the student love reading anything they want to and they think 4 books is reasonable.
5. Shorten time spent on prewriting. (7 disagree)	I think what they object to is prewriting without a real purpose. I think they are right.	5. I have discussed this with other 501 instructors. Next semester we will follow up each prewriting method with an in-class paragraph.
6. Too many assignments given at one time makes things confusing. (8 disagree)	6. I agree wholeheartedly.	7. During our 501 lunch meetings we have been discussing ways to delete or rewrit lessons. Our biggest solution is tied i with scheduling. We are moving many of t study skills assignments to the latter h of the semester.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY ON EVALUATING AND DEVELOPING COLLEGE FACULTY

Abrami, P. C., & Murphy, V. *A Catalogue of Systems for Student Ratings of Instruction.* Center for Teaching and Learning Services: McGill University, 815 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2K6, 1980.

Aleamoni, L. M. "The Usefulness of Student Evaluations in Improving in Improving College Teaching," *Instructional Science,* 7, 1978, 95-105.

Aleamoni, L. M., & Arreola, R. A. *A Practical Guide for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: measuring, evaluating, and grading instructional outcomes.* Memphis, TN: A. & A. Associates, 1986. Note: this is a resource document, available to those attending the authors' workshop. Workshop information is provided in the resource chapter of this report.

Aleamoni, L. M. in L. M. Aleamoni (ed.), "Typical Faculty Concerns About Student Evaluation of Teaching," *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 31, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Aleamoni, L. M.(ed), *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction.* New Directions in Teaching and Learning, No. 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Aleamoni, L. M. "Peer Evaluation: excerpted from Peer Evaluation, Note to the faculty, No. 15/Oct. 1984. Note: this excerpt appears in Aleamoni, L. M., & Arreola, R. A. *A Practical Guide for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: measuring, evaluating, and grading instructional outcomes.* Memphis, TN: A. & A. Associates, 1986.

Arreola, R. A. in L. M. Aleamoni (ed.), "A Faculty Evaluation Model for Community and Junior Colleges," *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 31, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Arreola, R. A. in A. Smith (ed.), "Establishing Successful Faculty Evaluation and Development Programs," *Evaluating Faculty and Staff.* New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 41, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Arreola, R. A., & Aleamoni, L. M., "Practical Issues in Designing and Operating a Faculty Evaluation System," *Handbook for Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System.* Memphis, TN: A & A and Associates, 1988. Note: this article is part of a resource binder, available to those attending the authors' workshop. Workshop information is provided in the resource chapter of this report.

Aubrecht, J. D. "Are student ratings of teacher effectiveness valid?," *IDEA Paper No. 2.* Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, Kansas State University, November, 1979.

Aubrecht, J. D. "Reliability, validity and generalizability of student ratings of instruction," IDEA Paper No. 6. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Kansas State University, November, 1981.

Bouton, C., & Garth, R. Y. (eds.). *Learning in Groups.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 1H. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Braskamp, L. A., Brandenburg, D. C., & Ory, J. C. *Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness, A Practical Guide.* Sage Publications, Inc., Beverly Hills, CA 90212, 1986. ISBN 0-8039-2342-2

Cashin, W. E. "Defining and evaluating college teaching," *IDEA Paper No. 21.* Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, Kansas State University, September, 1989.

Cashin, W. E. "Student ratings for teaching: recommendations for use," *IDEA Paper No. 22.* Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, Kansas State University, January, 1990.

Centra, J. A. *Determining Faculty Effectiveness: Assessing Teaching, Research, and Service for Personnel Decisions and Improvements.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Centra, J. A. in L. M. Aleamoni (ed.), "Formative and Summative Evaluation: Parody or Paradox?" *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction,* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Clark, J., & Redmond, M. "Small Group Instructional Diagnosis," *Innovation Abstracts,* Vol. IV, no. 18, 1982.

Cohen, P. A. "Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: a meta-analysis of multisection validity studies," *Review of Educational Research,* Fall, 1981, Vol. 51, No. 3, Pp. 281-309.

Cross, P. K., "Teaching 'For' Learning." Paper presented at the North Carolina State University Centennial Year Provost's Forum. Raleigh, NC, 1987. ERIC Document No. 280537.

Cross, P. K., & Angelo, T. A. *Classroom Assessment Techniques.* National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. University of Michigan, 2400 School of Education Building, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, 1988.

Cross, P. K., & Fideleer, E. F. "Assessment in the Classroom," *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice,* v. 12, no. 4, 1988, 275-285.

Davis, R. H., Fry, J. P., & Alexander, L. *The Discussion Method,* East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1977.

Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. *Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development: An Analysis of Effective Programs and Practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Gibbs, G., Habeshaw, S., & Habeshaw, T. *Fifty-Three Interesting Things to Do in Your Lectures.* Bristol, England: Technical and Educational Services, 1984.

Kurfiss, J. G. *Critical Thinking: Theory, Research, Practice, and Possibilities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2, Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1988.

Levinson-Rose, J., & Menges, R. J. "Improving College Teaching: A Critical Review of Research." *Review of Educational Research,* 1981, 51, 403-434.

Millman, J. *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation.* Sage Publications, Inc., Beverly Hills, CA 90212, 1981. ISBN 0-8039-1597-7

Seldin, P. "Court Challenges to Tenure, Promotion, and Retention Decisions," *Idea Paper No. 12.* Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, Kansas State University, September, 1984.

Seldin, P. & Associates. *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching. Moving from Talk to Action in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1990.

Simpson, E., & Oggel, T., "Growth Contracting for Faculty Development," Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, *Idea Paper No. 11.* Kansas State University, 1984.

Whitman, N. A., Neal, A., & Schwenk, T. L. *A Handbook for Group Discussion Leaders: Alternatives to Lecturing Medical Students to Death.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah School of Medicine. ED 233 623.

Whitman, N. A., Spendlove, D. C., & Clark, C. H. *Increasing Students' Learning: A faculty guide to reducing stress among students.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4, 1986.

Wilson, R. C. "Improving Faculty Teaching: Effective Use of Student Evaluations and Consultants." *Journal of Higher Education,* 1986, 57, 196-211.

Wilson, R. C. in L. M. Aleamoni (ed.), "Toward Excellence in Teaching," *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 31, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991